

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

JESUS I know, and God I know, but who is Christ?

There is an article in the *Hibbert Journal* for January with the title of 'Jesus or Christ?' The author is the Rev. R. Roberts, Bradford. In the same number there is a review of the *DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS*. The reviewer is the Rev. J. H. Weatherall, Bolton. The meaning of the article and of the review is the same. Both writers frankly cast away the name of Christ with all that belongs to it. Jesus they know, and God they know, but a Christ who is compounded of both they are resolved to have nothing more to do with.

The one article is a review of the *DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS*. The review has been somewhat long in coming, and there is not a great deal of it when it has come. But it is full of meaning.

The reviewer has no need for a Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. With this particular Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels he has little fault to find. But he does not need it. What he needs is a Dictionary of Jesus.

His 'interest in Jesus is eager and affectionate.' But for the name 'Christ' he would 'with all

reverence' substitute the name 'God.' The Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels should have been called a Dictionary of God and the Gospels. Let some one—Mr. Weatherall himself or some one else—now edit a Dictionary of Jesus.

The Rev. R. Roberts, who is described as 'Congregational Minister; late Chairman of the Bradford Education Committee,' is the author of the other article. He is very bold about it. It is no longer to be 'Back to Christ.' The cry is now to be 'Back to Jesus.' 'In developing the thought "Back to Christ," Evangelicalism,' he says, 'has found itself driven to make stupendous claims on behalf of Jesus.' *Are* they claims on behalf of Jesus? he asks; or are they made on behalf of a spiritual 'Ideal' to which we may provisionally apply the word 'Christ'? He gives the name quite provisionally. He is done with it long before his article is done.

Jesus I know—well, a little. 'The silence of non-Christian literature as to Jesus has more significance than is usually assigned to it. When we turn to the New Testament, we have a body of literature whose evidential value has been, and still is, the riddle of Christendom. Close and careful reading of its documents reduces our knowledge of the actual facts of the life of Jesus to a small, and, it must be added, a narrowing compass.

Beyond the narrative of birth and infancy and one incident in the boyhood; the Synoptists give us only detached fragments of events in one year of His life. The Johannine narrative extends the chronology so as to cover portions of perhaps the last three years. Criticism, of course, greatly reduces the value of this face view of the story. Following it, we pass through narrowing areas of admissible statement, till, guided by Dr. Schmiedel's "pillar" passages, we reach the position of Professor Khaltoff, from which the figure of the historic Jesus has completely vanished.'

Jesus I know a little; and God I know still less. But as for Christ—'Identifying Jesus with Christ,' says Mr. Roberts, 'they make God a Being who is omnipotent, yet limited in power; omniscient, yet defective in knowledge; infinitely good, yet One who declines "to turn any part of His knowledge as God into science for man." This seems to me to be language which stultifies itself. It would be an abuse of language to say that it deals with a mystery. It is flat contradiction.' That is the conclusion of the article and of the whole matter.

When the DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS was published it was spoken of as 'first of all a preacher's dictionary.' The same thing could have been said about the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. But in this case it seemed better to let the preacher find it out for himself.

He has found it out. 'I have sampled it in various places,' writes a correspondent of the *Methodist Times*. 'Last night, being exceedingly angry, I read the article on ABUSE. If any man wants to preach a number of sermons on this subject they are all here. The analysis is one of the most masterly things I have ever come across. There is also something upon the law of the matter that may be of use when you have to deal with a man who, in his anger, has "forgot nuthin'."'

'I had to take,' he continues, 'a class of old men, whose hearts are young enough, and of all sorts and conditions of good women, who have to bear burdens quietly. I read over the article on ACCEPTANCE, and, illustrating it out of Wesley's Hymns and out of the Old and New Testaments, I gave them the matter as a talk. Now, suppose I had said that I was going to talk to them out of the last encyclopædia, would they not have been justly dismayed? But they took to it as if it had been Wesley's Sermons.'

The Vicar of St. Andrews, Stoke Newington, has also discovered its use for the pulpit, and writes about it in his Parish Magazine. 'To some, perhaps,' he says, 'the problem will be where it is to go. But it must go somewhere, of that there is no question, even if a good many volumes of other kinds have to move. For it is indispensable.'

The reviewers also have made the discovery. The reviewer in the *Baptist Times* says: 'The Encyclopædia will be a complete armoury for the preacher and the teacher.' In the *British Congregationalist* the reviewer says: 'The ways in which this monumental encyclopædia will prove its worth are far too many to be suggested. That it will be indispensable to the minister who desires to be thoroughly equipped, we fully believe.' And if it is feared by any that preachers may be too well supplied for the exercise of their own originality, the *Church Times* closes with a word of reassurance: 'The profusion of information brought together on every topic may be expected to assist, instead of hindering, the exercise of an independent judgment.'

How is it, then, that an Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics is necessary to the preacher in addition to a Dictionary of the Bible? That question, which is central, has been answered by a preacher.

There is none of the reviews that has given the

impression of care and time (we might add intellectual ability) more emphatically than a signed review in the *United Methodist*. 'The need for such an encyclopædia,' says this reviewer, 'is beyond dispute. The first thing required of the preacher (after personal character) is that he shall know the Bible, and shall know it exhaustively and critically, in the spirit as well as in the letter, and in the light of the latest information available. To meet this demand there came the Dictionary of the Bible, followed by the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. But the preacher must know more than the Bible.'

What else must the preacher know? 'He must have a true sympathy with the religious aspirations of man. That sympathy is fed on the comparative study of religion, as he watches his fellows seeking God, if haply they may feel after Him and find Him. And though the seeking often seems to be merely groping, yet he views it with respect and even reverence as the expression of a religious instinct which cannot rest unsatisfied. Then in tracing back some theological problem, he is often led into the region of Natural Science, and has to appeal to the chemist or the biologist for guidance. Further, in seeking to apply his belief to the practical affairs of life, he is entering the sphere of sociology, and he needs the latest and best information on that subject.'

Now, as the reviewer says, 'it is too much to expect that the preacher should be a higher critic and a scientist and an economist; and if he attempts too much he is sure to fail in his mission. Yet his knowledge of these subjects, though it rarely appear in his conversation, and still more rarely in his pulpit ministration, is sure to aid him, to an almost incredible extent, in understanding and expounding the things that he most surely believes.'

And now let us take three sentences from the correspondent of the *Methodist Times*, of whom we have already spoken. 'Depend upon it, the

subjects here handled are going to keep the field for many a year to come, and are not only going to keep the field but to monopolize it very largely. If a man will use this book carefully, will ground himself in the leading subjects, and seek out the light that is here when he is bogged in his thinking, then he will become one of them that really know. I congratulate the young men of the ministry on this fresh stage in the evolution of their privileges and resources.'

One of the benefits which the Revised Version has conferred upon us is to compel our attention to the difference in modern English between small letters and capitals. We say 'in modern English.' For in the English of the time when the Authorized Version was made, capitals were used according to the fancy of the writer rather than the subject of the writing. And even the fancy of the writer varied with his mood or the fashion of the moment. Professor Arber has made out a useful *Harmony of Bacon's Essays*. Take a sentence from the essay 'Of Studies.' In the first two editions (1597-98) it appears thus: 'Craftie men contime them, simple men admire them, wise men use them'; in the third (1607-12) thus: 'Craftie Men contemne them; simple Men admire them, and wise men use them'; in the fourth (1612): 'Crafty men contemne them, simple men admire them, and wise men use them'; but in the fifth (1625): 'Crafty Men Contemne Studies; Simple Men Admire them; and Wise Men Use them.'

The Authorized Version can show nothing like that in the way of variety. The translators had received instructions from 'the Most High and Mightie Prince, James' that they were to be translators only, and not interpreters. So they were sparing for the time in the use of capitals. Still they used them. 'The chiefe Butler and the chiefe Baker' are both found with capital letters in the two editions of 1611, and even the 'Butlership' of the 'chiefe Butler.' The 'Tabernacle of the Congregation' is always honoured with a capital

letter, and everything that belonged to it, the 'Table' and the 'Candlestick' and the 'Altar of incense,' and the 'Laver.' 'Cassia' in the same chapter has a capital, though 'cinamon' and 'myrrh' are without it; even the measure called a 'Hin,' and the 'Apothecarie' who has the measuring of it.

When the Revisers began their work they found that most of the superfluous capitals had already been dropped from the Authorized Version. But a new difficulty presented itself. They were under no command to avoid interpretation. They found that they could not avoid it. And again and again they made their interpretation by the short but most unmistakable method of using or dis-using a capital letter.

In Mt 2⁶ the Authorized Version is 'For out of thee shall come a Governor.' The Revisers prefer 'a governor.' In 12⁸, 'For the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day,' the revision is 'lord of the sabbath.' In 12¹⁸ we come upon the central and difficult word 'spirit.' It is a quotation here from Isaiah. The Authorized Version uses a small letter, 'I will put my spirit upon him.' This is the way with all the previous versions but one. The Geneva Version has 'Spirit.' The Revised Version prefers the capital also. The speaker is God. In 23¹⁰, 'Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ'—so the Authorized Version. The Revisers say 'one is your master,' in this case departing from the Geneva of 1557, and following all the rest of the versions. The Geneva Version uses the old word 'doctor.' In the 1557 edition it is, 'Be not called Doctors, for ther is but one your Doctor, and he is Christe.' But in the edition of 1560 the capital is dropped—'doctors' and 'doctor.'

Does this matter of a small letter or a capital seem a trifling one? It is never trifling. In ordinary English it is always a matter of importance. Carlyle was as careful of his capitals as of

his punctuation; and we know that he was as careful of a comma as of a date. But in the English translation of the Bible it sometimes rises to a matter of the highest moment.

One of the arguments which Professor Denney makes use of, in his new book on *Jesus and the Gospel*, in order to prove that Jesus was not a fellow-believer, but the object of faith to the writers of the New Testament, is the use that they make of the word 'Name.' Three times that word is used absolutely. In Ac 5⁴¹ we read that 'they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the Name.' In 3 Jn 7 we read that 'for the sake of the Name they went forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles.' In both passages the Revisers recognized the force of the word and used the capital letter. But there is a third passage. In Ja 5¹⁴ Dr. Denney holds that the true reading is, 'Let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the Name.'

The twentieth series of the Cunningham Lectures was delivered last winter by the Rev. W. Fairweather, M.A., and the volume containing them has now been published. Its title is *The Background of the Gospels* (T. & T. Clark; 8s. net).

When it was known that the Cunningham Lecturer for 1907-8 was to be the Rev. William Fairweather, it was expected that the subject of the lectures would be Judaism in the period between the Old Testament and the New. For Mr. Fairweather has given himself to that subject so closely, and has written so much upon it, that they can scarcely be thought of apart. And it was hoped as well as expected. For the religion of the times preceding the Christian era has lately been discovered to carry far-reaching influence. It touches the interpretation of the Gospels at every step. It touches the Person of Christ.

Our Lord has much to say about the end of the

world. So have the pre-Christian Apocalypses. Did He simply take over the popular conceptions derived from these Apocalypses? Again, and to bring the matter to a point, the Apocalyptic literature anticipates the end of the world as near at hand. Did He also anticipate its speedy end? And was He mistaken?

Mr. Fairweather examines the evidence. He has read what the Apocalypses have to say about the end of the world; he has read what Christ said; and he has read what the modern critics have said about the Apocalypses and about Christ. He considers that on two points the evidence is sufficient and the controversy closed. One point is that the belief of the nearness of the end is inherited by the New Testament from the Apocalypses of pre-Christian Judaism. The other is that the Apostles of our Lord shared it. The Apostles shared it—and were mistaken. That is what Mr. Fairweather means. Did our Lord share it? Was He mistaken also? That is the question for us.

Now Mr. Fairweather refuses to be deterred from investigating by any consequence. 'We are here,' he says, 'upon ground where we must tread reverently.' But we must tread it. And if we find that our Lord was mistaken, we shall receive strength to understand. Wendt says it is 'manifestly presupposed.' Bousset says it 'cannot be denied.' Charles says it is 'proved beyond question.' What does Mr. Fairweather say?

He reviews the evidence. Now the evidence which the scholars who have just been named rely upon is a series of passages in the Synoptic Gospels. These are the passages: 'Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power' (Mk 9¹), or as St. Matthew has it, 'till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom' (16²⁸). 'This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished' (Mk 13³⁰). 'When they

persecute you in this city, flee into the next: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come' (Mt 10²³).

But these are not all the passages. In the Parables of the Ten Virgins and the Unmerciful Servant, Christ speaks of the Parousia as if it were not to take place until after a long period of waiting. The Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven, and again the Parable of the Blade, the Ear, and the Full Corn, imply so gradual a growth of the Kingdom as manifestly to demand much time. And openly, and without a parable, Christ makes the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles a necessary prelude to the final consummation of the Kingdom. That, says Mr. Fairweather, was clearly not practicable within a single generation.

Thus there are two classes of passages which deal with the time of the End. Mr. Fairweather takes both into account. He recalls three independent attempts which have been made to reconcile them. Professor Bruce suggested that the great eschatological discourse recorded in Mt 24 and Mk 13 is not a unity, but a piecing together on the part of the evangelists of sayings uttered on separate occasions, with the result that future events are represented as closer at hand than the words of Jesus really warranted. Professor Godet thought that the passages which seem to imply the imminent nearness of the end refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, and not to the end of the world, so that it is only the destruction of Jerusalem that Jesus places within the lifetime of the current generation. Dr. Forrest holds that our Lord spiritualized the popular eschatological terms, and so, while He saw with penetrating glance the true significance and final issues of moral facts and forces, He saw them in no exact temporal perspective, or in the relations of far and near.

With none of these methods of meeting the situation is Mr. Fairweather quite satisfied. He

goes back to what our Lord says about Himself. Is it possible that He was ignorant of the time of the End? There is one thing that He says He was ignorant of on earth. It is closely related to this very thing, if it is not this very thing itself. 'Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father' (Mk 13³²). And he comes to the conclusion that Christ's impression as regards the time of the Parousia may not have been a constant quantity. He thinks that it may have oscillated somewhat in view of new developments in the providential order. And the extreme limits of oscillation may be reflected in those passages on the one side which speak of the End as if it were to be long deferred, and those on the other side which seem to imply that He considered it near at hand.

Many books have been published lately on Mysticism. But the growing interest in it will make another welcome—*The Mystical Element of Religion*, by Baron Fr. von Hügel (Dent; 2 vols., 21s. net). And the more welcome that it comes from a Roman Catholic. For Mysticism has been the peculiar possession (should we not add the peculiar glory?) of the Roman Church throughout all her history. The Roman Catholic is at home here.

Seven years ago, Baron Friedrich von Hügel began to study the Life and Writings of Saint Catherine of Genoa. He had been born in Italy, and early impressions had remained with him. He had felt and he retained 'a vivid consciousness of the massively virile personalities, the spacious trustful times of the early Renaissance there, from Dante to the Florentine Platonists.' These personalities, these times, were 'as yet truly Christian.' He grew up; he acquired strong and definite religious convictions. These convictions were often out of touch with the types of devotion prevalent in Western Christendom. But when hemmed in and depressed, his mind went back to that early Italian world, that ampler pre-

Protestant, as yet neither Protestant nor anti-Protestant, but deeply positive and Catholic world, and he was strengthened and sustained. He prayed that some day he might be permitted to portray one of those large-souled pre-Protestant, post-mediaeval Catholics.

Then came John Henry Newman's influence, with his *Dream of Gerontius*, and the attraction of St. Catherine of Genoa, with her doctrine of the soul's self-chosen intrinsic purification. Twenty times he visited Genoa, 'the terraced city that looks away so proudly to the sea.' He found the records of St. Catherine's life and doctrine in apparently hopeless confusion. No trained scholar had seriously analysed them since their constitution into a book in 1552. He had done much critical work on classical and scriptural texts. Could he not endeavour to bring stately order out of this bewildering chaos, perhaps discover the authors, the dates, and the intentions of the various pieces of this many-coloured Joseph's coat? It would train his own mind. It would bring him within the atmosphere of a most delicately psychological, soaring, yet sober-minded eschatology, with its striking penetration and unfolding of a soul's central life and alternatives. He resolved to write the Life and edit the Works of St. Catherine of Genoa.

But who could come in contact with such a life and such a religion without desiring to discover the worth of so keen a sense of, and absorption in, the Infinite? Having begun to write a biography of St. Catherine, with some philosophical elucidations, Baron von Hügel finished by writing a great book on the philosophy of Mysticism, illustrated by the life of Caterinetta Fiesca Adorna and her friends.

It is not a book for review. No review could give any adequate account of its richness, its luxuriance, of idea; or of the well-matched luxuriance of language which this Italian born has made his obedient instrument. The author

himself has followed three separate threads of interest throughout it—one historico-critical, one philosophical, and one religious,—and he fears that his readers may follow one thread to the neglect of the other two. But he need not fear. There is no such likelihood. There is no such possibility. He has left out of account his own personality, which weaves all the threads into one piece of precious tapestry, complicated enough in pattern, absorbing enough in interest to the most diverse types of mind. The purpose of writing a review of it has long been laid aside. The present purpose is to say something about the thoughts which have come to St. Catherine of Genoa and to Baron Friedrich von Hügel about Heaven.

St. Catherine believed in Purgatory. Baron von Hügel believes in Purgatory also. He believes that a truly purgational middle state with its sense of succession, its mixture of joy and suffering, its growth and fruitfulness, is profoundly consonant with all our deepest spiritual experiences and requirements. We may not agree with him in that. We do not agree with him. But what he says about Purgatory does not vitiate what he says about Heaven. It is curious to note that there is little disagreement in the various branches of the Church of Christ regarding the state of Bliss. However long they make the journey, and by whatever variety of road the soul is supposed to travel, there are no great Catholic or Protestant controversies regarding the state that is reached at last. If Heaven were all our preaching, we could close our ranks to-morrow. Baron von Hügel discusses three things which perplex him about Heaven, and they are things of the most fundamental importance. But there is no hint or fear that they will be made the watchword of sects or parties.

The first thing that perplexes Baron von Hügel about Heaven is whether there will be Time there. Tennyson held that there would be neither Place nor Time:

From out our bourne of Time and Place,
The flood may bear me far.

Rothe held that there would be both. Baron von Hügel agrees with neither. He has been studying again Kant's critique of the two categories of Space and Time, and he has come to the conclusion that Time is of indefinitely richer content and more ultimate reality than Space. He believes that we are done with Space when we are done with this world, but that we shall carry Time with us into the next.

Not clock time. Not mathematical uniform time as it is measured atomistically on the face of a clock, but time in its interpenetrative duration. But what does St. Augustine say? He says that in the next life our thoughts perhaps will not be flowing, will not go from one thing to another, but we shall see all we know simultaneously in one intuition. And what does St. Thomas say? St. Thomas is more positive. All things in Heaven, he says, will be seen simultaneously and not successively. Now, Baron von Hügel is too good a pre-Reformation Catholic to differ when St. Augustine and St. Thomas agree. Yet he cannot believe that duration will come to an end. For its entire absence would apparently make man into God. He therefore thinks that 'the category of Simultaneity will, as a sort of strong background-consciousness, englobe and profoundly unify the sense of Duration. And, the more God-like the soul, the more would this sense of Simultaneity predominate over the sense of Duration.'

His second perplexity is whether the happiness of Heaven is abstract or concrete. Is it pure thought alone, or is it also emotion and will? Is it solitary and self-centred, or is it social and outgoing?

Now if the mystical state is to be taken as the nearest approach that we see upon earth to the heavenly state, it may be expected that the happiness of Heaven will be pure thought alone, self-centred and solitary. But the biographer of St. Catherine of Genoa traces a sad impoverishment in the religious life to the esteem in which the antique world

generally held the psycho-physical peculiarities of trances, when it looked upon them as directly valuable, or even as prophetic of the soul's ultimate condition. The exaltation of the contemplative above the active life was an inheritance which the Christian Church received from Plato and Aristotle. It was a corruptible inheritance. Life is complete and perfect only when it embraces both elements, each at its fullest, and the two in a perfect interaction. And in the world to come, when earthly power doth then show likest God's, the highest life must be the life of him who takes a direct and detailed interest in the world as God does, and cares for every sparrow that falls to the ground.

The last of Baron von Hügel's perplexities is whether there will be any pain in Heaven. He thinks there will be. He cannot think that it would be Heaven without it.

For what is the highest and best thing that we know upon earth? It is devoted suffering, heroic self-oblivion, patient persistence in lonely willing. Will there be no equivalent in Heaven? It would certainly be a gain, says Baron von Hügel, could we discover it. For a pure glut of happiness, an unbroken state of sheer enjoyment, cannot be made attractive to our most spiritual requirements.

Some Problems suggested by the Recent Discoveries of Aramaic Papyri at Syene (Assouan).¹

BY THE REV. OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.A., D.D., CAMBRIDGE.

THE recent discoveries of Aramaic papyri near Assouan (Aswân) have thrown a welcome light over an obscure period of Jewish life, viz. 470-407 B.C. Our Old Testament sources for information respecting this period are: (1) Certain undated prophecies, viz. those ascribed to a writer designated as Malachi, and those which have been collectively termed during the last fifteen years 'Trito-Isaiah.' Critical investigations of the contents have led nearly all scholars to ascribe the first (the oracles of Malachi), and the majority of recent scholars to ascribe the second (the Trito-Isaiah chapters 56-66), to the earlier part of this period of sixty or more years. It should be observed, however, that this view has recently been challenged by Rothstein in his essay on *Jews and Samaritans*. I say nothing at present about the prophecies of Joel.

(2) Belonging to the second rank of evidence we have the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which were compiled about two centuries after the events to which they refer took place. Here we are in the midst of controversy as to the actual historic value

of the documents. The most that we are warranted in affirming (though the followers of Kusters would demur to this statement) is that the researches of Ed. Meyer go far to vindicate the historic value of certain portions of Ezra and Nehemiah as based on contemporary official records and as on other grounds inherently probable.

We welcome, therefore, the appearance of these papyri, and congratulate those who have edited them, as they present to us a bright and clear spot of light in the prevailing obscurity—that long period of deepening historic uncertainty that shrouds Jewish history from 500 B.C. till 170 B.C., the eve of the Maccabæan revolt. Fortunately there is no scope for endless argumentations about the date of these documents, viz. the three papyri from the stronghold of Yeb, with its temple to Yahu, edited by Sachau, and the collection of business documents, edited by Cowley and Sayce, belonging to a somewhat earlier time. For most of these documents are dated. It is true that they belong to an outlying region, and not to Palestine or even Babylonia. Yet they are, nevertheless, of great value. For the three papyri edited by Sachau, to which I shall mainly refer, are copies of a letter addressed from the Jewish settlement at the

¹ Read before the Third International Congress for the History of Religions held at Oxford, Semitic Section (September 16, 1908).

stronghold Yeb to the viceroy or *pehah* (Assyr.-Aram. *paḥath*) of Judah in the seventeenth year of Darius Nothus, *i.e.* 407 B.C.

This paper may be described as an attempt to use these documents as a lamp in the midst of historic gloom. It will be an endeavour to see how far the light it affords will carry us into the contemporary and earlier history of Israel. It must therefore be largely tentative. It will raise more problems than it can possibly solve.

I. The Aramaic in which these documents are written is essentially the Biblical Aramaic. It clearly shows, in combination with many other indications, that at that time the Canaanite Hebrew was rapidly becoming obsolete as a spoken language by Jews. It confirms the truth of the rendering of the disputed word *mephōrāsh* in Neh 8⁸ given in the margin of the R.V., 'And they read in the book, in the law of God, with an interpretation; and they gave the sense, so that they understood the reading.' Aramaic had become at that time the ordinary spoken language of at least the majority of the Jewish exiles, and the ancient Hebrew tongue was unfamiliar.

This Aramaic language was obviously well understood in *official* quarters in Palestine at the time when the letter from Yeb was composed. And it was also well understood by the educated and official class in Jerusalem three centuries earlier in the days of Hezekiah, as the appeal by the rulers to Rabshakeh in 2 K 18²⁶ (the earlier Isaiah narrative) clearly indicates: 'Speak to thy servants in Aramaic; for we understand it.' As far back as the eighth century Aramaic had become the *lingua franca* of Western Asia.¹ Archaeological evidence brings this fact home to us in ever-increasing volume. Thus the legal and commercial documents, in the newly published volume by Albert Clay, of cuneiform texts from Nippur belonging to a period that extends from the seventh to the fifth centuries, frequently consist of tablets with endorsements in Aramaic. The Aramaic power to the north of Palestine reduced both northern and southern Israel to vassalage in the latter part of the ninth century, and since that time, in fact long after the political power of Aram had been broken, its language spread far and wide. Questions affect-

ing the literary criticism of the O.T. now present themselves. About a quarter of a century ago our great Oxford *altmeister* Professor Cheyne asked the pertinent question: 'Does it follow that every Aramaism in Isaiah is a corruption?'² I would put the question in another form: How far, in the light of present knowledge, are we to allow the appearance of sporadic Aramaisms to determine the lateness of a passage?³

II. The letter from the sanctuary at Yeb throws some light upon the date of Joel. Here archæology appears to confirm critical conclusions. Nowack, Cornill, and Marti argue from internal indications that Joel's prophecies were composed about 400 B.C. Now at the close of these oracles we read (4¹⁹) that Egypt is to become a desolation on account of the outrages perpetrated on the Jews. These outrages may surely be connected with the destruction of the temple at Yeb by the Egyptian priests of the God Hnûb, to which the letter addressed to Bagohi bears witness. This wanton act of destruction probably formed part of a wholesale persecution of the Jews settled in Egypt, which took place about the year 409 B.C. It is not at all necessary to assume that the outrages committed by Edom, to which the same Joel passage makes reference, belonged to this year or generally to the same time.

III. There is clear proof that the Jewish temple at Yeb existed in the early post-exilic period. We read in lines 13 f. of Sachau's Papyrus I:

'When Cambyses invaded Egypt he found that shrine (*i.e.* the temple of Yahweh at Yeb)⁴ built,

² *Commentary on Isaiah*,³ 1884, vol. ii. p. 138.

³ This applies to the elaborate and skilful argument, based upon diction as well as other grounds, set forth by Professor Kennett, whereby he endeavours to refer the Messianic prophecy Is 9¹⁻⁷ to Simon the Maccabee (*Journ. of Theol. Studies*, April 1906). Doubtless a portion of its text has become corrupted. Apart from this, the presence of Aramaisms in a Messianic oracle by Isaiah, which obtained a wide circulation in extra-Palestinian, Israelite, or even non-Israelite settlements, should surely, in the light of the facts already adduced, not surprise us. It can hardly be denied that our knowledge of the Hebrew actually spoken and written in the days of Isaiah, since that knowledge is based on our many times redacted Old Testament, is severely limited and somewhat conventional. And, in addition to this, it must be remembered that a prophecy by Isaiah of such a character would have wide currency in the growing Hebrew diaspora of the seventh century, and would be likely to be subject to the influences of the Aramaic-speaking Israelite communities living beyond the Palestinian border.

⁴ Yeb was identified by Clermont Ganneau with Elephan-

¹ So also Cowley in the Introduction to *Aramaic Papyri*, p. 20, 'Aramaic before the Persian period was the language of trade, and we find it in the dockets of Assyrian and Babylonian deeds from the eighth century downwards.'

but the shrines of the gods of Egypt they destroyed every one, while in that shrine no one injured anything whatever.'

This invasion of Egypt by Cambyses took place in 525 B.C., or about twelve years after Cyrus had overthrown Babylon. Now the special favour shown by Cambyses to the Jews in Egypt in sparing their temple was evidently a continuation of his father's policy. The tolerance and favour shown by Cyrus to the religion of other peoples, and especially to the religion of Babylonia, is clearly shown in the clay cylinder of Cyrus. Now the theory propounded by Kosters about fifteen years ago, as is well known, denies *in toto* the story of the proclamation of Cyrus for the restoration of the temple in Jerusalem contained in Ezr 1 and in 3⁷, on the ground that no allusion is made to such a restoration in the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, and that there is no return of any considerable body of exiles from Babylonia soon after 538 B.C. presupposed in the oracles of these two prophets. It is impossible to discuss this question now. It is sufficient to say that this policy of protection to the Jewish temple at Yeb pursued by Cambyses does cast a glimmering ray of light on the tradition of a restoration of the Jerusalem temple under the warrant of an edict by Cyrus. It certainly enhances the probability of the tradition. So much, at least, we may say without affirming the historic accuracy of every detail in the first chapter of Ezra.¹

IV. The papyri edited by Cowley and Sayce reveal the existence of a large and prosperous Jewish settlement at Syene. Now there is a very problematic passage in Is 49¹², 'Lo, these shall come from far; and these from the land of Sînim.' The passage is an interesting parallel to Is 11^{11f}. This land Sînim has been in early times associated with the east, e.g. in the LXX, where it is identified with Persia. This probably arose from the previous mention of the north and west. The Targum and Vulgate only conjecture that the *south* was meant. The attempt to identify the name with China, which was attempted by tinê. 'Both Syene and Elephantinê were the twin fortresses which protected Egypt on the south from the incursions of the Soudanese tribes' (*Aramaic Papyri*, ed. Cowley and Sayce, note p. 37 on Papyrus B, line 3).

¹ These words were written before I had seen Rothstein's essay, *Juden und Samaritaner*, where the same argument is developed.

scholars like Victor von Strauss-Torney in his excursus to Delitzsch's commentary, has had a natural fascination for friends of the great missionary cause. But quite apart from the difficulty occasioned by the initial sibilant, China appears to have been quite unknown to the Jew, as well as to the Babylonian, of the sixth century. No reference to it is to be found in the Table of Races in Genesis. It was evidently beyond the field of vision of the Jews of that day.

But by the very slight emendation of a single character, the change of the first י into a י gives us סִינִים in place of סִינִים. Everything then becomes clear. Syene or סִינִים is mentioned by Ezekiel in his oracles on Egypt (29¹⁰ 30⁶). That a large mercantile Jewish population existed at Assouân at that time may be regarded as certain, i.e. about 150 years before the Aramaic letter from Yeb was written.

V. But as we pass further back in time, our path becomes beset with shadows.

The temple was standing in the days of Cambyses, i.e. 120 years before these papyri were written. It was, as the document shows, a spacious and imposing edifice. It had seven gateways of hewn stone (line 10), and a roof of cedar (line 11), and sacrificial bowls of gold and silver (line 12). The Jews in Syene were evidently as prosperous as some of those became who followed the advice of Jeremiah and settled in Babylonia (29⁴⁻⁷). Moreover, the offerings of the temple, burnt offerings, meal offerings, and incense (line 21, cf. 25), and also the custom of fasting in times of sorrow (line 20), exhibit no suggestion of illegitimate forms of worship. There is no mention of an *ashêrah* or of anything that indicated the traditions of a Canaanite high place such as *kedêshîm* or *kedêshôth* with which the prophets Hosea and Amos and the Books of Kings make us familiar. Yāhu or Yahweh was the only deity worshipped. The priests of other deities are called by the Aramaic plural equivalent of the Heb. *kemārîm* of the O.T. (line 5). Professor Sayce in his Introduction (p. 10) notes that the Jewish 'proper names are compounded with that of Yahweh as much as the names of the orthodox Jews who returned to Palestine from the Captivity.' They are therefore very different from the Jews of Pathros 180 years earlier, whom Jeremiah rebuked for burning incense to the queen of heaven

(44¹⁵). It is well-nigh certain that these last were emigrants of the days of Jehoiakim, while the Jews of Syene were the descendants of a still earlier migration.¹

The inference which I would tentatively draw is that the origins of this purer worship at Syene go back to the days of Hezekiah, whose reforms in worship are reported to us not only in 2 K 18⁴, but also in 21³, and also in 18²², which belongs to a distinct source (the earlier Isaiah biography). *These* were the influences which, in the first instance, probably affected the settlement at Syene, and *not those* of the reformation in the days of Josiah, when centralization of worship was a ruling principle, and when, moreover, the relations of Judah to Egypt were the reverse of friendly.

With respect to the origin of the temple-building at Yeb, the language of the Papyrus is vague. The writer is able to go back 120 years, to the days of Cambyses, but he is conscious that it had a greater antiquity, and can only vaguely say (line 13) that 'already in the days of the kings of Egypt our fathers erected that temple in the fortress Yeb.' This points to a time anterior to the Persian domination. But the temple itself was probably preceded in earlier days by another and simpler structure.

We are inevitably led to consider another question closely bound up with the preceding, namely, What was the most probable period when any considerable Diaspora of Jews began to exist in Egypt? A diaspora might indeed have begun as far back as the latter part of the ninth century B.C., when the Syrian wars reduced both Israel and Judah to the abject condition of vassal states. But it is more probable that we have to go to a period just one century later, when the Assyrian invasions must have driven multitudes of Hebrew emigrants to seek an asylum in Egypt. Of this we have clear indication in Hos 9³⁻⁶, and as this passage raises some important questions, I shall quote it in full. 'They shall not dwell in Yahweh's land; but Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and in Assyria they shall eat what is unclean.

¹ A careful examination of Jer 42-44 seems clearly to show that the Jews settled in Migdol, Tahpanhes, and Memphis (Noph) had *recently* migrated thither, and the fresh emigrants under Johanan ben Kareah were joining their kinsmen in Pathros and elsewhere. The language used by the inhabitants to Jeremiah (44^{18f.}) refers to their untoward experiences in *Palestine* and not in Egypt (cf. 42¹⁴).

They shall offer no libations of wine in Yahweh's honour, nor set in order² (יערכו) for Him their slaughtered offerings. As food of mourners shall be their food. All who eat thereof shall be rendered unclean. For their food shall be for their appetite, it shall not come into Yahweh's house. What shall ye do at the feast-day or when Yahweh's festival takes place?' What follows obviously requires a slight emendation, and we may render: 'Behold they make their way to Assyria.³ Egypt shall gather them, Memphis bury them.' Evidently a considerable stream of Israelite refugees from the Assyrian invasions had begun to flow towards Egypt.

When we pass to the last decade of the eighth century we find a close connexion subsisting between Hezekiah and Egypt. Hezekiah did not rule over a large realm, yet he held a strategically important position on the highway from north to south and from east to west, in that mountainous region south of Samaria, flanked by the Dead Sea, and also exercised control over the Philistine towns. That interesting and misdated little oracle on Philistia (Is 14²⁸⁻³²) probably belongs to this last decade of the eighth century. V.³² clearly shows that the Philistine towns looked to Hezekiah for support against the Assyrian invaders. The political significance of Hezekiah, as suzerain and protector of these towns, is clearly seen in the Prism inscription of Sennacherib. That he held a fairly strong position seems to be indicated by the facts narrated in one of Sargon's inscriptions, which charges him with forming a coalition against the Assyrian power with Moab and other states, and yet no actual attack upon his territory is recorded. When we turn to the Prism inscription of Sennacherib, his importance is shown by the considerable space devoted to him in columns 2 and 3.

Therefore in Egypt, where by this time a considerable settlement of Israelites must have lived, he would be naturally regarded as Israel's sole remaining champion against the Assyrian power, while the Egyptians themselves, who were only beginning under the twenty-fifth dynasty to emerge from weakness and disunion, had every reason to pray that Hezekiah's kingdom might endure and his influence be maintained over the

² For יערכו of the traditional Heb. text.

³ For they 'make their way to Assyria,' the traditional Heb. text has 'have gone from destruction' (שָׁדוּ).

frontier fortresses that barred the approach of an Assyrian army. Even Ethiopia in its hour of apprehension, as the oracle in Is 18 shows, sent its messengers in papyrus boats down the Nile to Jerusalem.

My justification for referring to these points is that they have an important bearing upon the historic conditions involved in a very interesting and problematic passage in Is 19, upon which the recent discoveries throw, as it appears to me, an unexpected light. This nineteenth chapter, as all Old Testament scholars know, is a patchwork of detached fragments referring to Egypt, chiefly non-Isaianic, each separate oracle beginning with the formula so common in Isaiah, 'In that day.' One passage only do I hold to be of Isaianic origin, viz. vv. 19-22. It is certainly pre-Deuteronomic; otherwise it would not have found a place in a Judæan canonized prophecy; but having had a definite and assured position among Isaiah's oracles prior to 620 B.C., it was eventually relegated to an isolated position among other oracles relating to Egypt. The passage runs (vv. 19-22) thus: 'In that day there shall be an altar to Yahweh in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar beside its border unto Yahweh. And it shall serve as a sign and witness unto Yahweh of hosts in the land of Egypt whenever they cry unto Yahweh by reason of oppressors, so that he may send them a helper and contend and deliver them. So Yahweh shall be known unto the Egyptians, and the Egyptians shall know Yahweh in that day; and shall serve him with slaughtered offering and meal offering [LXX have only 'with offering'], and they shall vow vows unto Yahweh, and pay them. And Yahweh shall smite the Egyptians, smiting and healing; and they shall be converted to Yahweh, and he shall be intreated by them, and shall heal them.' This oracle prophesies future trouble and disciplinary chastisement to the Egyptians. Evidently Assyria, 'the rod of God's anger' (Is 10⁵), is meant, and we know that this 'smiting' did take place in the days of Esarhaddon and Ašurbanipal. In the earlier part of the oracle the expression, 'they cry unto Yahweh by reason of oppressors,' is doubtful as to its reference. To me it looks like a reflexion of Old Israelite history. The reference is to Israelites oppressed by Egyptians as in old times rather than to Egyptians oppressed by a foreign foe.

This is the section to which, as Josephus tells us (*Wars of the Jews*, VII. x. 2), Onias, son of

Simon, appealed when, under Ptolemy's friendly protection, he erected a temple at Heliopolis. I premise that no such passage as this could possibly have been inserted in the Jewish copies of the prophetic writings after the Exile period. *Such a passage as this*, which deliberately legitimizes the erection of an altar in the midst of Egypt, could hardly have found a place in Jewish writings of recognized validity after the temple of Zerubbabel was built, unless it had, like the documents J and E, the prestige of ancient authority.

Now the phrase which occurs in the Hebrew text of this oracle, *zebhaḥ uminhah*, 'slaughtered offering and meal offering,' is a difficult one in a pre-Deuteronomic passage, since the exclusive signification 'meal offering,' for *minḥah*, which it presupposes, is *post*-Deuteronomic. Nevertheless, it is found in Am 5²⁵, 'Did ye offer me slaughtered and meal offerings in the wilderness forty years?' which has all the appearance of being genuine. Here the LXX render σφάγια καὶ θυσίας. Marti, however, may be right in regarding the addition 'and meal offerings' to be a later gloss inserted in the Amos text, for all O.T. scholars are aware that such later glosses are not infrequent. But when we turn to this *Isaiah* passage, our scruples vanish. We are constrained to cancel at least one of the terms (in this case *zebhaḥ*) out of the text, for the LXX have καὶ ποιήσουσι θυσίας (there is no σφάγια). This difficulty therefore vanishes.

I would suggest that the 'border of Egypt' in this text might naturally refer to Assouân, and that a primitive sanctuary was erected in that place, already a settlement of Jewish and Israelite refugees. Such a distant part of Egypt might well be designated by a Palestinian inhabitant by the really appropriate term 'a boundary.'¹ We might suppose that the *massēbah* (forbidden in the Deuteronomic legislation Dt 16²²) was first set up at Syene in the first decade of the seventh century B.C.

If this view be accepted, we are in the presence of what appear to be distinct conceptions existing at the same period respecting Yahweh's domain and sovereignty. The *one* seems to be reflected in the passage already quoted from Hosea, which regards the land to which Israel migrates outside Yahweh's land (which is Palestine) as an *unclean* land. This was no doubt the old popular tradition which we find reflected in various passages in the

¹ See footnote 4, pp. 201-202, which shows that Elephantine (Yeb) was in reality a boundary fortress.

Books of Samuel and elsewhere, which I need not quote. One point, however, might be noted, that the Hosea passage lays more definite stress on the uncleanness of Assyria than of Egypt.

On the other hand, the *Isaiah* passage reflects very clearly the logical result of the teaching of Amos respecting Yahweh's universal sovereignty, which Isaiah had certainly learned. The point which I wish now to suggest is that the application of the doctrine was more easy to Egypt, which was *then*, moreover, a friendly country. Hosea speaks of Israel as 'returning' to Egypt, for out of Egypt Yahweh 'called his Son.' Despite the protests called forth in various quarters against Winckler's theory of the land Muṣr, we ought surely to accept it to *this* extent, that such a land did actually exist south of Judæa, as definitely proved on more than one line of evidence. It took its name, analogously to the name Syria (abbreviated from Assyria), from the old extension by conquest of the Egyptian frontier eastwards over the Sinaitic peninsula and the region to the north of it. In this region, let it be remembered, stood Yahweh's ancient sanctuary Horeb, to which Elijah fled in his days of persecution. So it was not difficult to regard Yahweh's sway as extending to Egypt.¹ Even in the Deutero-Isaiah Egypt is especially God's own. He gives it to Cyrus as his ransom for Jewish freedom (43³), just as Ezekiel before him announces that Yahweh gives Egypt to Nebuchadrezzar as hire for his service in besieging Tyre (Ezk 29¹⁸⁻²⁰).

VI. There is yet another passage on which the Aramaic papyri appear to throw a special light. I refer to the mysterious verses in Malachi (1^{10f.}), which express a universalism which has been variously interpreted, 'I have no pleasure in you, saith Yahweh of hosts; and offering from your hand I refuse to accept. For from east to west my name is great among the nations; and in every spot incense is offered to my name, and a pure sacrifice: for great is my name among the nations, saith Yahweh of hosts.' Are we to regard this passage, as some recent expositors have taken it, as

a general recognition by Malachi of a prevalent monotheism among heathen nations and the worship of the Highest, perhaps with special reference to the Persian adoration of Ahura Mazda; or shall we recur to the interpretation of Ewald, who saw here a reference to the purer and nobler worship rendered in the Jewish diaspora? The recent discoveries would seem to indicate that this latter is the more probable view. But if this be a valid conclusion, the Malachi passage carries with it a yet wider inference. 'The setting of the sun' or west would point to such a sanctuary as that of Yeb. But there were also other sanctuaries in the '*rising of the sun*.' Is it possible that the relics of these may yet be unearthed by the explorer?

This last passage is full of interest. It shows the persistence, even about the year 458 B.C., in the degenerate days of Judæan life that preceded Nehemiah's advent, of those broader conceptions respecting Yahweh's sphere of influence and the Yahweh religion and cultus to which Amos and Isaiah first gave the impulse. The attentive study of these papyri and the illuminating preface of Professor Sayce heighten the impression that the true home of this broader, nobler conception of religion was in the Diaspora. The stimulating work of Dr. Moritz Friedländer, *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums*, which I trust many Englishmen will read, makes this very clear. The request for help to restore the sanctuary at Yeb was ignored by the priesthood of Jerusalem.² And these larger conceptions had to fight hard for centuries against that spirit of exclusiveness which had its centre at Jerusalem. This latter spirit was subsequently reinforced by the forces of Pharisaic nationalism kindled to white heat by the Macca-bæan struggle. And yet we can see in Jewish literature, especially in that of the Diaspora, such as the writings of Philo-Judæus, that the larger conceptions still survived. But they had to wait through weary centuries until there arose the potent voice of the last and greatest of the Hebrew prophets, who said to an inhabitant of Samaria: 'The hour cometh when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. . . . God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth' (Jn 4²¹⁻²⁴).

² Comp. lines 17-19 in Sachau, Pap. I.

¹ We might note in this connexion the somewhat exceptional position of privilege assigned to the Edomite and the Egyptian in the Deuteronomic legislation, Dt 23^{7f.} [^{8f.} Heb.], as contrasted with the Ammonite and Moabite. Also we may take note of the union between Abraham and Hagar the Egyptian (Muṣrite).

Modern Positive Theology.

BY THE REV. JOHN DICKIE, M.A., TARLAND, ABERDEENSHIRE.

IV.

Conclusion.

SUCH then are the main interests of the Modern Positive Theology, as of Christian Theology in general in our day—the question of the authority of Scripture and of Ecclesiastical Dogma, and the doctrine of Christ's Person and Work. The leaders of the movement approach these great problems with due appreciation of the issues involved, and in a spirit at once candid and reverent, which cannot but command the respectful attention of every serious religious thinker. We must also sympathize with the desire to make the 'Old Faith' intelligible to the 'modern man' in spite of all extravagance like Grützmacher's in the delineation of him, 'a species of idolatry' which draws from Kaftan the just protest, 'Truth asks no one whether she is to his liking or not. Every one has to bow the knee to her, the modern man as well as the ancient.'

But what is there of originality in these positions? How far is there gain for us, either intellectually or religiously? It goes without saying that Theo. Kaftan and Seeberg are not the first Christian thinkers who have tried to present the Old Faith in a new light. The abiding problem of Theology is just to mediate between the eternal gospel and the mutations of human knowledge and opinion, with perfect justice to both. Of this the Modern Positive Theologians are fully aware. They tell us that problems and solutions are continually shaping themselves anew. 'The Hellenisation of the Gospel was in its day a necessary modernising process.' Kaftan says that as a matter of fact all theology, that is, *real* theology, is modern, only more or less; and that he is simply attempting to do what Augustine and the other great theologians of history did for their own time. Quite so, only the heretics were making the same attempt, and both were assured that their thinking was timeless. The conscious recognition of the relativity of the theology is distinctively modern. Yet it is not new in principle even in Positive circles. Kaftan's Erlangen Professor, Hofmann, spoke in words

almost identical with his of 'a new method of teaching Old Truth.' Both Hofmann and Seeberg's teacher, Frank, would have regarded themselves as *Modern* Positive Theologians, in contradistinction from mere traditionalists like Philippi, though standing much nearer the tradition than Theo. Kaftan or even Seeberg. There is nothing new about the idea of a 'Modern Positive Theology,' or a 'Modern Theology of the Old Faith,' though the names are new.

Theo. Kaftan is very difficult to classify. He claims to be 'a Confessional Lutheran, and not a follower of Schleiermacher,' but the influence of the theological movement inaugurated by Schleiermacher is at least as much in evidence as the Confessional Lutheranism. He is a Kantian in philosophy, like R. A. Lipsius and Ritschl. But theologically his instincts are more conservative than theirs, though he is decidedly the freest and most independent of the Modern Positive group. Like many others, he sees that nearly all the intellectual interest and enthusiasm are on the so-called 'modern' side, while the practical work of the Church both at home and abroad is almost entirely left to the religious zeal and earnestness of those least affected by the modern spirit. But is modern theology necessarily fatal to Christian activity? Is practical Christianity indissolubly wedded to a theology which no longer commands the assent of the intelligent and intellectually active? Such is the problem as it presents itself to him. He has too much faith both in human intelligence and Christianity to answer either question in the affirmative. As things are at present, there is strength and weakness on both sides. But cannot we have the strength of both, without the weakness of either? Surely that would be the natural combination—a modern theology without the paralyzing weakness that comes of mere negation, a theology enshrining the old historic faith of Christendom in its power and fulness. This theology will submit to no merely external authority; will be conscious

of its own limitations; will welcome all knowledge of reality, and will in consequence be on good terms with exact science, though the science of history is the only science in which theology has a vital interest. In its broad outlines this programme cannot but meet with general acceptance. Its most questionable features are just where it comes nearest the old Ritschlian position, as in the rejection of metaphysics—perhaps the chief point of contrast between Kaftan and Seeberg. Theology must of course welcome all pertinent facts from whatever source. But is its interest in history different in kind from its interest in other sciences? Is it not interested in them all alike, chiefly in their *metaphysical*, or in what Lipsius called their *teleologico-religious* ('religiös-teleologisch') bearings? Kaftan's work bears throughout the impress of a fresh and original mind. But in spite of its value as a general statement of principles, a 'modern' theologian will find nothing new in it.

A 'positive' theologian, on the other hand, will learn how and upon what grounds, in his opinion, 'the Old Faith' with which 'Christianity stands or falls,' demands a 'Modern Theology.' Perhaps its chief service consists in the emphasis with which it asserts that there are some things which Christianity cannot concede to the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, without losing its own identity. But I do not know that it marks any substantial advance in the determination of these things.

In an 'Author's Preface' to the English translation of his *Grundwahrheiten*, published since the commencement of these articles, Seeberg claims that 'theologically educated readers will easily discover the framework of a new Dogmatic System.' Is this claim justified? I scarcely think so. Seeberg's Dogmatic System is just that associated, for two generations now, with his old University of Erlangen, modernized in some particulars. It is the theology of Hofmann and Frank modified by the freer attitude to Scripture and Ecclesiastical Dogma which I have already described, and with a more real sense of what the Christian consciousness can vouch for, and what it cannot. But here again the difference is relative. Frank found fault with Hofmann for making the Christian consciousness responsible for too many of the details of Scripture and Dogma; Seeberg raises the same objection against Frank himself. Seeberg has distinguished more precisely than his precursors between what is given immediately in Christian experience, and

the dogma which follows therefrom by way of inference. He has likewise recognized more fully than they that there is much in the Bible which does not belong to the substance of religious faith. He is more alive to the relativity of dogma, and to the historical conditions by which it was partly shaped. These are 'modern' elements in his theology. But they are already fully recognized in 'modern' circles, nor are they built together with the 'positive' elements valued by him into a single harmonious whole, so that each part is necessary to the others. The framework is not new, and the materials built into it are new only in their present connexion.

The Erlangen Theology seems to me capable of far greater things than it has yet achieved. 'What am I, and what do I believe, as a Christian, and upon what grounds?' If theology were to investigate these questions as earnestly, as thoroughly, and as critically, as philosophy does the elements of self-consciousness, I am convinced that we should receive great gain therefrom. Further, Seeberg's work is a development of that theology along what I regard as fruitful lines in a natural direction. But he has not given us 'the framework of a new Dogmatic system.' The elements which he brings together are not new, nor is the principle of their organization.

Seeberg was brought up in the orthodox Lutheran faith, and has experienced no intellectual or religious cataclysm. His present positions, so far as they are different from those of his early manhood, are the result of a gradual and imperceptible change; and he doubtless feels himself a better and not a worse Lutheran in consequence. He has, or had, the full confidence of the vast body of average conservative theological opinion in Germany. Schian says: 'He can ill be spared, the brilliant lecturer, the admirable stylist, the cultured writer, the accomplished theologian.' But we are more concerned to note that with his antecedents and associates he is prepared to go so far, and that he is so generally regarded as a 'safe' guide. The reception accorded his *Grundwahrheiten* is an indication of how general such an attitude to Scripture and Dogma is becoming even in 'positive' circles. Far more important than his work as head of the Modern Positive School is his valuable *Text-Book of the History of Dogma*, where he seeks to mediate between the Ritschlian tendency to depreciate Dogma, and the disposition among

Conservative Theologians to regard it as inviolable.

So far as I can judge, the ablest of the younger men is Beth, who occupies the chair in Vienna to which Lipsius went in 1861, and who may yet advance as far beyond the positions of his teacher

as Lipsius did after that date. Grützmacher, on the other hand, in spite of his industry, is too violent and too self-satisfied for a responsible theologian. But if one may judge from their present performances, it may be questioned whether the group has distinctiveness enough to hang together as a school.

Literature.

MOULTON'S NEW TESTAMENT GRAMMAR.

GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.
By J. H. Moulton, M.A., D.Lit. Vol. i.
Prolegomena. Third Edition. (T. & T.
Clark. 8s. net.)

WHEN the first edition of Professor Moulton's *Prolegomena* appeared, the present writer had an opportunity of discussing it with Dr. Deissmann. And he can recall how, after freely extolling its merits in the generous terms he has so frequently employed since, the famous German Professor concluded, 'And certainly Moulton is not *langweilig* ("wearisome").' The justice of this remark will be at once conceded. Grammars are not as a rule enlivening reading, but Dr. Moulton has succeeded in imparting to his pages so many brilliant suggestions and fresh and humorous touches, that it is not to be wondered at that these, combined with the book's well-known more solid qualities, have succeeded in sending it into a third edition within three years of its publication.

To the outstanding merits of the work it is unnecessary to recur: they have already had full justice done to them in the pages of this magazine (vol. xvii. p. 450 ff.) by so competent an authority on the language of the Greek New Testament as Professor H. A. A. Kennedy of Toronto. All that is required in the present instance is to draw attention to the fact that Dr. Moulton has taken advantage of this new edition to make a large number of changes and additions (for the convenience of the possessor of the earlier editions these are detailed on p. xv of the new Preface), and to expand very considerably the Greek Index.

Apart from these improvements, the present volume is to all appearance a reprint of the second edition. And it is not perhaps too much to ask that when a fourth edition is called

for, the publishers will find it possible completely to reset the work, so as to admit of the amalgamation of the two series of Additional Notes, and also to allow the author a freer hand in the revision of his original material.

Previous to this, however, we earnestly trust that Professor Moulton will have given us the second volume, that is being so eagerly looked for. It is true that work such as this cannot be hurried, and that the amount of research required in the case of the papyrus and other documents of which he is making such large use, is simply enormous. At the same time there are many evidences that he must already have the bulk of his material at his command, and we look confidently to his allowing no *parerga*, however interesting in themselves, to stand in the way of the completion of this all-important work. In the Preface to the present edition Dr. Moulton speaks feelingly of the fact that Professor Schmiedel in his new edition of Winer is still in the middle of the sentence where he left off ten years ago. Let him see to it that he does not give the Zurich Professor the least possible excuse for a '*tu quoque*' retort.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

THE GREEK AND EASTERN CHURCHES.

THE GREEK AND EASTERN CHURCHES.
By Walter F. Adeney, M.A., D.D.
(Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 12s.)

So great has been the success of the 'International Theological Library' that the series is to be extended, and, for one thing, it is to cover the History of the Church. No doubt the merit of Principal Lindsay's *Reformation* has helped to form that resolution; it will also help to carry the series to a triumphant finish.

Principal Adeney has been chosen for the great and difficult history of the Greek and Eastern Churches, and he has succeeded in compressing his period into a single volume of six hundred pages. A single volume quite easy to read it is, and seems to suggest equal ease in the writing. But test it. Test it at those crucial places where the nice balance of probabilities seems to say that truth is a trifle. Principal Adeney has the conviction that truth and falsehood are the greatest facts in the world, and utterly opposite; and yet he knows that in historical investigation it is often just a grain of probability in either scale that makes the balance turn. He takes account of that grain. Here he owes a circumstance to the discovery of a Gothic manuscript in the Louvre, there to a conversation with Professor Gwatkin. We thank him for his care. We have readable histories in plenty. To-day we desire the utmost special knowledge to be placed at our disposal, so difficult is it on many points to know where the facts lie in regard to this great division of Christendom. That Dr. Adeney has given all the world a charming book of English literature to read is something further to be thankful for.

JESUS AND THE GOSPEL.

JESUS AND THE GOSPEL: CHRISTIANITY
JUSTIFIED IN THE MIND OF CHRIST.
By James Denney, D.D. (*Hodder &
Stoughton.* 10s. 6d.)

There are two questions which Professor Denney sets out to answer in his new book. The first is: Has Christianity existed from the beginning only in the form of a faith which has had Jesus as its object, and not at all in the form of a faith which has had Jesus simply as its living pattern? The second is: Can Christianity, as even the New Testament exhibits it, justify itself by appeal to Christ? We have given both questions in his own words. His book is simply the answer to them.

It therefore consists of two parts. In the first part Professor Denney goes over the whole of the New Testament for the purpose of showing that its writers, one and all, separate Jesus from all other men, and make Him the object of their faith. This is his deliberate purpose. Let him be careful that he does not come under the lash of Professor Schmiedel's pen, and be called an apologist. But though this is his deliberate purpose,

he is ready to disclaim any 'apologetic' intention. Nothing, so far as he is conscious, is set down for any other reason than that he believes it to be the truth. So he says; and, further, that, to the best of his knowledge, he speaks without reserve, and has neither more nor less to say. No man can write without being an apologist, just because no man can write without having convictions of some kind. He is an apologist, in the offensive sense, only when he bends the facts to fit his convictions. This Professor Denney does not do. Again and again he maintains his ground against the paring, nibbling criticism of men like Professor Schmiedel, and in particular against Professor Schmiedel himself. But he does so because he is able to give good reasons for doing it. Occasionally also he uses the concessions of such men with skilful effect, as when Professor Schmiedel admits that the speeches of Peter in the early chapters of Acts must have come from a primitive source; but he uses them legitimately and with restraint. The second part is the more difficult, and it occupies much the larger portion of the book. It deals with the question of the self-consciousness of Jesus. For the question to be answered is whether Jesus did actually, as we see Him in history, acknowledge and accredit the faith of the early Christians. And to answer that question Professor Denney has to survey the whole of the life of Christ upon earth.

Thus the volume is truly apologetic. For it meets two of the most serious attacks that are made upon Christianity in the present day; on the one side, the position that the Christ of the Church is independent of the Jesus of history, and possesses all the worth we care for, a position associated most of all with the name of Abbé Loisy; on the other side, the argument that the Jesus of history is all we need consider, and that He is simply human, an object of imitation, but not of adoration.

It is a book of very great weight, to which no review can do justice. The more sustained the attempt to do justice to it, the greater would be the injustice. For it is an argument from beginning to end, and no words can be spared or links dropped in exhibiting it. The reader must read the book. Here and there, however, sentences are thrown off which can be quoted, sentences which assume their gnomic form through the length of time that the writer has meditated

upon these problems. 'The characteristic of primitive Christianity is not the belief that Jesus *was* the Christ, but the belief that He *is* the Christ.'—'Jesus is demonstrated to be the Christ and is preached in that character, not merely or even mainly on the ground of what He had said and done on earth, but on the ground of His exaltation to God's right hand and His gift of the Holy Spirit.'—'The Apostles and their converts are not persons who share the faith of Jesus; they are persons who have Jesus as the object of their faith and who believe in God through Him.'—'In the Epistle to the Colossians Paul is not directly deifying Christ, he is Christianizing the universe.'—'The Fourth Gospel contains the word rather than the words of the Lord.'—'There is a unity in all these early Christian books which is powerful enough to absorb and subdue their differences, and that unity is to be found in a common religious relation to Christ, a common debt to Him, a common sense that everything in the relations of God and man must be and is determined by Him.'

AN EDITION DE LUXE.

MEN OF THE COVENANT. By Alexander Smellie, M.A., D.D., with Portraits and Illustrations. (*Melrose*. Two Vols. 31s. 6d. net.)

In this new edition of his *Men of the Covenant* Dr. Smellie pays a graceful compliment to his publisher. 'And I am so deep in my Publisher's debt that I can discover no language that will properly express my obligation; it was he who conceived, and he who has carried out, the idea of this *Edition de Luxe*, in which you see on Japanese vellum the presentments of men and women *who wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth.*'

The compliment is unusual and well deserved. After all that has been said in the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES in praise of the godliness and patriotism and good writing found in the book called *Men of the Covenant*, what remains to be said except to appraise the work of the publisher? And that cannot be overpraised. In this *Edition de Luxe* there is nothing out of place, nothing that can possibly offend the most artistic sensitiveness or the severest Puritan conscience. The Men of the Covenant are figured as they

have become known to us from contemporary portrait, untouched by modern fancy or favour; they are drawn just as they were, uncomely to look upon in some cases (though in others handsome as cavaliers), but all showing the strength that can do and endure. And besides the Men of the Covenant there are portraits of their persecutors, and there are pictures of the places where the persecutions were given and received—pictures of some of the 'dens and caves of the earth.'

The artists are Miss Pike and Mr. Scott Rankin. 'Readers,' says the author, 'will agree that the work of Miss Pike and Mr. Scott Rankin is beyond praise.' We agree.

THE PRACTICE OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE ETHICS OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Dr. Theodor von Haering. Translated from the Second Edition by James S. Hill, B.D. (*Williams & Norgate*. 10s. 6d.)

The translator of Haering's *Christian Ethics* has made a statement which is sure to be challenged. He says: 'Books on ethics abound, but scarcely books on Christian ethics.' Yet it is true. It could have been a stronger statement than it is, and still have been true.

Now there is no doubt that Professor von Haering has written a book on *Christian Ethics*. But after he has written it, and after it has been translated into excellent English, there is room for a book on *Christian Ethics* to be written. Professor von Haering writes a book on *Christian practice*. But the first thing that we need set clearly before us is the revolution in the *ideas* of Ethics which Christ made. The difference which Christ made in matters of conduct has been recognized all along. It could not be hid. But why is it that the Christian conduct is so often pronounced impossible or quixotic? Because it is not seen that the new conduct is the inevitable expression of a new conception of the relation between man and man. Until the revolution in the conception of conduct is recognized, *Christian Ethics* will never be admitted to a right to the title of Ethics.

The best way to study the revolution in Ethics which Christ made is to study it in language. New ideas need new words, or old words with new meanings. Christianity occasionally used a new

word, or recovered a word that was in little use, or poured a new meaning into an ordinary everyday word. All this has to be studied. Then it will be understood that the Ethics of Christianity, and none else, deserves the name of Ethics.

Professor von Haering has not studied these ideas. He has taken the Ethics of Christianity at the practical stage, and without showing why, has shown that the practice of Christianity is different from all practice before it or after. He has shown this in great detail and with great ability. As a manual of the conduct of life for those who believe in Christ it could not easily be surpassed.



Among the Books of the Month.

The fascination of the folk-tale! When Mr. Dudley Kidd with much perseverance gets at last to the back of the black man's mind, what a revelation of humanity he finds. His new book has the forbidding title of *The Bull of the Kraal* (A. & C. Black; 6s.). But it is most entertaining. Has he written it for children? The Kafirs are all children; and so are we when we get so near to nature.

Professor Driesch of Heidelberg has finished his Gifford Lectures in Aberdeen, and the second volume has been published—*The Science and Philosophy of the Organism* (A. & C. Black; vol. ii., 10s. 6d. net). Their delivery was a sensation. It was not always an agreeable sensation. For the hard-headed Aberdonian is not to be puzzled with a matter of metaphysics without writhing under it. But on the other hand, if the details were difficult to sort, it was possible to follow the general argument, and that argument was reassuring.

For Dr. Driesch is a monist of the type that Haeckel is not. A monist and a materialist! Dr. Driesch has passed beyond the very conceivability of it; and he will carry past its conceivability any one who reads him without prejudice.

His merit, however, lies in his superiority to the old controversies. He occupies another region. It is a higher, a more advanced region of thought. We can never go back to the question of matter or spirit, spirit or matter; not even to the antithesis

science or philosophy, philosophy or science. All is one. And that one? 'All is of God that is and is to be, and God is good.' That is Whittier, but this severe eminent man of science and philosophy would say 'Amen' to Whittier.

We hope Dr. James Murray is on his track. We have not looked, but may ask if the Oxford Dictionary contains 'Engramma,' 'Entelechy,' 'Epiphenomenon,' 'Extensivity'—all in E; or, the great word in the book, 'Givenness.' But when new discoveries are made we need new names to call them by.

As the study of English takes a more important place in schools and colleges, the necessity will be felt for an *Introduction to the Natural History of Language*. The volume is ready (Blackie; 10s. 6d. net). It has been written by Dr. T. G. Tucker, Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Melbourne.

A book with such a title is surely more than a manual for the teaching of English. It is not forbiddingly more. It is the application of the science of philology to the English language. The Greek or Latin or other foreign words that appear are no stumbling-block to the English reader. No more knowledge of the classics is necessary than is supplied in every English classroom in the form of etymology.

Accordingly Professor Tucker has written a sufficiently full account of the English language. For he wastes no words, and his book runs to 465 pages. One might say that the first half of the book is introductory. And so it is, if the phrase 'English Language' is taken in a narrow sense. But that is because Professor Tucker's plan is to lay a strong foundation before he allows the pupil to entertain himself with the history of individual English words. But then, when the foundation is laid in comparative philology, how entertaining is the tracing of the vicissitudes of an English word like 'alms.'

Miss Emmeline M. Tanner, B.A., History Mistress at Sherborne School for Girls, has written a text-book of European History for 1494-1610, which has been published at the Clarendon Press (3s. 6d.). The title is *The Renaissance and the Reformation*. If it does not belong to a series it may not attract the notice it deserves. Let us therefore say emphatically that it is a book of the

rare class which combines pleasant reading with practical study.

In the Days of the Councils, a sketch of the Life and Times of Baldassare Cossa. By Eustace J. Kitts, I.C.S. (Constable; 10s. 6d. net). Who was Baldassare Cossa? He was Pope John XXIII. And few are any wiser. For Ranke's *History of the Popes* is not so popular now as it used to be, and no other book has quite taken its place, not even Creighton's *History of the Papacy*. We do not read great histories now. We read biographies. We must have even our history served up as biography, here a little and there a little. And so it may chance that we know nothing of Baldassare Cossa, or it may chance that we stumble upon Mr. Kitts's book and know all about him that is to be known.

For it is history after the approved biographical method, and it is the best that that method can do. The style is not so masterly as Ranke's or even Creighton's, nor (which is part of the style) is the outlook so uplifting. But Mr. Kitts has been a most diligent student of the time, and he is detached from all selfish interests in his writing. What he sees he sees clearly, and he writes, if not for immortality, at least for the present enjoyment of the lover of biographical history.

Mr. H. G. Wells is not a professional maker of paradoxes like Mr. G. K. Chesterton. His paradox is himself. In a moment of frolicsome confidence he and some others resolved that they would tell one another what their religious feelings were, and what were their ideas of right and wrong. Mr. Wells got a surprise. He was surprised at the interest of the subject, and the greatness of it, and most of all was he surprised at the religious and ethical muddle he found himself in. He wrote a book about it all, and called the book *First and Last Things* (Constable; 4s. 6d. net).

He recommends us to begin at the beginning of his book and go to the end. But it is very difficult to do that. Not on account of the metaphysics, as he fears, for the metaphysics is mild enough, but on account of the paradoxical amateurishness (he calls himself an amateur) of all the religion and all the ethics contained in the book. He speaks, for example, of secession. He seems to doubt if secession is ever justifiable. 'I count schism a graver sin than heresy.'

Well, it is not to be lightly spoken of, or lightly taken in hand. But Chalmers seceded. Luther seceded. St. Paul seceded. And if the story is not too ancient for the use of ethics, Abraham also, when 'he went out, not knowing whither he went.'

There are worse things than secession, Mr. Wells. In the course of history it has been the regularly recurring way in which God has enlarged the knowledge of Himself. And how can you say that it is worse than heresy, when the only heresy you know is 'not believing in the light'?

Messrs. Constable have found a ready market for their 'Religions' series, and so now they have entered on a companion series, 'Philosophies, Ancient and Modern.' The volumes already published are *Locke*, by Professor S. Alexander of Manchester; *Hobbes*, by Professor A. E. Taylor of St. Andrews; *Stoicism*, by Mr. St. George Stock; and *Early Greek Philosophy*, by Mr. A. W. Benn, M.A. (1s. net each).

For a typical Methodist preacher take the Rev. Dinsdale T. Young. In every book you find the simplicity of the gospel, its winsomeness also; direct speech (not a word is wasted), and that which distinguishes the Methodist of our day, to other men's surprise—a clear sense of the obligation which the preacher owes to scholarship. Mr. Young's latest volume of sermons is *The Travels of the Heart* (Culley; 3s. 6d.).

The Rev. Alexander Macrae, M.A., has written a spirited and patriotic short history of Scotland during the last two centuries (1707 to 1907). The title is *Scotland since the Union* (Dent). The last chapter is the most original. Its title is 'Religion.' The subject is rarely handled in this comprehensive way, and Mr. Macrae has had to work it out from many books and records. For it is not a chapter of ecclesiastical history but actually of Religion.

From Drummond's Tract Depot in Stirling come once more the *British Messenger* (1s. 6d.), the *Gospel Trumpet* (1s.), and *Good News* (4d.), all for 1908. There come also this year *Idylls of the Poor* (1s. 6d.), and some small pamphlets, soundly evangelical and acceptable.

God's Message through Modern Doubt is a perfectly accurate description of the volume of sermons by the Rev. E. Aldom French which Messrs. Duckworth have published (2s. 6d. net). For Mr. French takes up topics that are on the tip of the tongue even of the churchgoer and boldly utters them, and then answers them. 'The Recklessness of Providence,' for example. That is to say God's carelessness (or apparent carelessness) in guarding His own best gifts. A promising fruit season is destroyed by a single night's bitter east wind. A successful missionary is stricken with malaria. Or again, 'the Irony of God.' Take the irony of the fact that the kingdom of good comes often by the *victory* of the kingdom of evil.

Who is to be Master of the World? This is the title of a new attempt that has been made to explain Nietzsche to Englishmen (Foulis; 2s. 6d. net). The attempt is made by Mr. Anthony M. Ludovici, who asked his friend Dr. Oscar Levy to write an introduction to the book. Dr. Levy consented, wrote the introduction in the form of a letter to the author, and it is here. And what is it? It is a repudiation of the whole book, its contents and its very conception. Why? Not because it is not well done, but because it should not have been attempted. The book is a very good attempt indeed to explain Nietzsche, the clearest if not the profoundest that we have yet seen. But who, asks Dr. Levy, has any right to explain the man whose whole merit lies in this, that he cannot be explained, that he himself detested the very thought of being explained? And then, worst of all, Mr. Ludovici has women in his lecture room. Women! And he will go and marry one of them. Dr. Levy holds up a reproachful finger: 'Remember that you too have to propagate a gospel, and not a race; and that even the propagation of the race, if it is to be worth while, can only take place after the propagation of the gospel.'

Intense interest is being taken at present throughout the Theological Seminaries of America, in what is called the formation of the New Testament—a more intelligible title for the subject which we used to know as Introduction. A lively book was written last year by Dr. George H. Ferris, which everybody is making ready to answer. But there will not come a better answer than that which has already been made by Professor Vedder

of Crozer, under the title of *Our New Testament: How did we get it?* (Philadelphia: Griffith & Rowland; \$1 net).

Dr. Ferris set the example of independence. It is refreshing to find even so conscientious a scholar as Professor Vedder departing from the phraseology that was always cumbersome and had become a little stale, and speaking of a 'Collection' instead of a 'Canon,' the 'Disputed Books' instead of the 'Antilegomena,' and so on. But the discussion is refreshing throughout, and nowhere more than in the chapter on 'The Voice of Authority.' What is the result? The result is that there is no such thing as an external authoritative canon of Scripture for the Protestant; 'the true foundation of a Christian's faith is not a book, but a person.'

Of books on Palestine we can never say, Hold! enough! For two reasons. First, the poorest observer will always find something new to say, so manifold is the interest of that least of all lands. Second, no amount or variety of fact or of illustration will exhaust its wonder. Perhaps the greatest of its wonders is its habit of disappointing. One would almost say that it disappoints deliberately, just as one might say the sacred spots were deliberately lost before pilgrimages could begin to be made to them. But then it is the disappointment which afterwards yields much fruit.

Dr. Henry van Dyke has written another book. *Out-of-doors in the Holy Land* is its title (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is a tourist's impressions enriched from a literary theologian's well-stored memory. And the publishers have added the further enrichment of full-page colour illustrations.

The late Mr. Kirkman Gray wrote one book and died. It was more a promise than a performance. Why he was not spared to fulfil the promise we cannot tell. He had gathered the materials, laid the plans, and partly written the large book that was intended to be its fulfilment, when quite suddenly he was taken away. Then Miss B. L. Hutchins, with the aid of his wife, his brother (Dr. G. Buchanan Gray), and Mr. Will Reason, went to work on the unfinished book and prepared it for the press. It is the best posthumous and unfinished book we have seen.

The subject on which Mr. Kirkman Gray had begun to be recognized as an authority was the

economic progress of the poor. On the promise of his first book he was chosen to write the article on AGITATION for the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. The title of this book, however, is *Philanthropy and the State* (King; 7s. 6d. net). It is too narrow. But it does express the special and most valuable contribution which the book makes to economics. Mr. Gray had studied the efforts of philanthropy in London, and had come to the conclusion that they were a failure. That judgment he modified afterwards; but throughout the book he shows the necessity of legislation and State administration to supplement and direct, though not to replace, the private philanthropist's work.

There is not a word of preface to *Youth and Life* (Law; 2s. 6d. net) to explain the origin of this series of 'Talks to Young People.' The title-page is filled with names, mostly well-known names, some highly distinguished; and then we plunge into the 'Talks' with 'The Culture of Manliness,' by the Rev. J. G. Stevenson; and if we go to the end we have read seven-and-twenty of them, ending with 'The Joy of Consecration,' by the Rev. Charles Brown.

Through Mr. Law is published also the record of *A Winter in South Africa*, by the Rev. F. B. Meyer, B.A. (2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Longmans have published a sixpenny edition of John Stuart Mill's *Autobiography*, well printed. There are now cheap editions of all John Stuart Mill's works except the *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy*, which still costs 16s. But the only other that has attained to the glory of sixpence is *The Subjection of Women*.

The American Cambridge Bible for schools and colleges (its own title is *The Bible for Home and School*) is published in England by Messrs. Macmillan. The new volume is *Hebrews* (2s. 6d.), by Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed of Chicago.

Transfiguration is a great word. The Rev. E. W. Moore, M.A., Incumbent of Emmanuel Church, Wimbledon, has written a volume all on Transfiguration, under the title of *Life Transfigured* (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net). And

it is not on the Transfiguration of our Lord, but on the Transfiguration of His disciples. He begins with the Pattern, it is true; but after a few pages he passes to the Transfiguration of the Sinner; and then the book deals with the Necessity of that, its Promise, its Marks, and its Conditions. And it is not exactly equivalent to a treatise on Sanctification, though perhaps it may fairly be taken as a sign that the old theological words are not so useful at present for the preacher as other words are.

We have given Dr. Garvie's Westminster Commentaries a hearty welcome. Let us receive the new volume more heartily than its forerunners. It is *St. Mark*, by Professor S. W. Green of Regent's Park College (Melrose; 2s. net). What is it that makes commentaries on St. Mark better than all other commentaries?

From all quarters of the globe comes evidence of the place that the study of Religion now has in the interests of those who are most anxious for the progress of the Kingdom. The latest is a thick volume on *Peru: its Story, People, and Religion*, written by Miss Geraldine Guinness, illustrated by Dr. H. Grattan Guinness, and published by Messrs. Morgan & Scott (7s. 6d.).

It is, we say, a stout volume, part of its portliness being due to the plate paper on which the illustrations are printed, part to the amount of matter at this fortunate young author's disposal.

Dr. Alexander Macalister, who introduces the book, says it is astonishing how neglected Peru has been, not merely by the British missionary societies, but also by the American and all other. The ground is fresh and very rich.

Well, the greater the neglect the more the joy of the discoverer. In this book there are many illustrations which are new, and more than that there is a whole new country to add to the geography of the gospel. Miss Guinness shows the way. She inherits the double gift of the missionary and the author.

The Doctrine of the Last Things, Jewish and Christian (Murray; 3s. 6d. net), is the subject of all others upon which Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley is fit to write. And few are fitter. It is quite a popular book that he has written this time, not attempting to untie knots that cannot be untied,

and reducing references to the absolutely essential. It is a book for the beginner in this most difficult of all subjects of theological study. It is an introduction. It does not carry us all the way. But it is reliable.

Mr. Murray has also published *Select Passages from the Theological Writings of Benjamin Jowett*, edited by the late Professor Lewis Campbell (1s. net). Some of the passages have not been published before.

The *Dante Gabriel Rossetti* book is published by Messrs. Newnes (5s. net). It contains photographs, hung detachably, of the great pictures, fifty-seven in all. The photographs are the best that modern photographic art can produce. And the volume is in accordance—also the best that modern publishing art can produce. The only writing in it is a Biographical Study of thirty pages, made by Mr. Ernest Radford, and a Table of Dates.

Messrs. Nisbet have published their three annuals. One is *Nisbet's Church Directory and Almanack* (2s. net); one is *The Church Pulpit Year Book* (2s. net); and one is *The Full Desk Calendar* (1s. net). Each of them is the best of its kind.

Wonderful value for the money is Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier's 'Living Thoughts' Series (6d. net). Each volume is chosen for its religious and literary worth, and each is a work of twentieth century art in book production. The new volume is *The Great Career*, by the Rev. J. Ernest Rattenbury.

At the office of the *Open Court* in Chicago Dr. Paul Carus, the indefatigable and the brave, has published five volumes together. Five volumes of most unmistakably religious interest, and each vying with the other in independence. This is the first article in the creed of Dr. Carus—independence. Tradition is nothing, and the idea which so irresistibly sent Newman into the Roman Church, the idea that 'the whole world' cannot be wrong, is pure heresy to Dr. Paul Carus and to those who write for him. The 'whole world' is more likely to be wrong than not. The 'whole world' almost always has been wrong. But, right

or wrong, the 'whole world' is nothing to Dr. Carus. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

These are the titles of the volumes and their authors—*God*, by Paul Carus (4s. 6d. net); *Jesus and Modern Religion*, by Edwin A. Rumball (3s. 6d. net); *What we know about Jesus*, by Charles F. Dole, D.D. (3s. 6d. net); *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, by Rudolph Otto, translated by H. J. Whitby, D.D. (2s. 6d. net); *Paralipomena*, by Bernhard Pick, D.D. (3s. 6d. net). Now take them in the reverse order.

Dr. Pick gives a translation of all the remains of gospels and sayings of Christ which have been discovered in our day. And so here we have for the first time in one volume the Gospel, the Preaching, and the Apocalypse of Peter.

Otto's *Life and Ministry* we already know. It is a sketch, but it is drawn with firmness and without fear.

Dr. Dole asks the most urgent question of the day. But he has no cut and dried answer. Let every man construct for himself a history of Jesus out of the few fragments of history which a critical reading of the Gospels leaves us.

Again Jesus. But not the Jesus we knew before or ever heard of. Professor Schmiedel's Jesus comes near. But Mr. Rumball is independent even of Professor Schmiedel. He does one thing well. He shows how monstrous a creation is the 'neo-Hegelian' Jesus, the Jesus who is nothing historically and everything ideally.

Last of all and best, Dr. Paul Carus himself on *God*. The book is well worth reading even under such a title.

The new volume of the International Scientific Series is *Human Speech* (Kegan Paul; 5s.). The author is Mr. N. C. Macnamara, F.R.C.S.

Mr. Macnamara begins at the beginning. He begins with a discussion of what life is. He passes to the structure of protoplasm, the effect of environment on living matter, and he has reached his seventh chapter and hundred and fifteenth page before he touches the vocal apparatus in man and woman.

Thus the book is an introduction to the study of biology, with *Human Speech* as its chief illustration.

But when the illustration is reached it is comprehended as it would never have been if it

had formed the sole topic of the book. Mr. Macnamara has done his work deliberately after this plan, and he has done it most successfully. His style is precise and not pedantic. The illustrations bring the subject within the comprehension of the least scientifically educated.

John Davidson (he would not thank us for a preliminary Mr.) is a poet. He is a poet in the days when poetry is as precious as the word of God was in the days of young Samuel. He is also a better Christian than he thinks. And you will read his new book, *The Testament of John Davidson* (Grant Richards; 3s. 6d. net), with relish.

Ten sturdy evangelicals have conspired to write a book on *The Church of Christ* (Scott; 2s. 6d. net). One of the ten is the Dean of Canterbury, who introduces the other nine. Each of the nine has his plot of ground allotted to him, and he has skill to cultivate it to advantage. After reading Dr. Orr one wonders what reply a High Churchman can possibly make. After reading Mr. Webb-Peploe one is content without a reply. For the proof of the true Church is the men it produces.

'Beauty is truth, truth beauty,' said Keats, the poet, and the professional architect wholly agrees with him. Mr. Felix Clay, B.A., architect, has written a volume on *The Origin of the Sense of Beauty* (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 6s. net). It is quite in harmony with the simplicity of present-day art that he should speak of Beauty, not of Æsthetics. It is also in harmony with his purpose. For his purpose is to enable the ordinary lover of a picture to understand his own feelings and in understanding to correct and develop them. He is a practical architect. He is also a reader of books. His list of literature is such a selection as will really guide the student to fuller knowledge.

Alcuin of York was a considerable personality in his day. He was mixed up with most of its problems and made his own contribution to most of its perplexities. It cannot be said, however, that he made any permanent contribution to Religion or Ethics. He was an ecclesiastical rather than a religious leader. Probably his immersion in the details of administration would have made any substantial contribution to thought

impossible, even if his mind had been more fertile of ideas than it was. And last of all, his style of writing was simply impossible. The Bishop of Bristol's Monograph (S.P.C.K.; 5s.) certainly sets down naught in malice, yet it cannot be said to make out a case for absolute greatness. A Church leader, a man of much personal goodness, and an acceptable comforter in sorrow, Alcuin of York will not be forgotten.

Dr. S. H. Mellone has in his *Laws of Life* (S.S.A.; 1s. net) laid down some rules of conduct in their simplest and most intelligible form for those who stand at the very threshold of it.

Messrs. Washbourne have issued a second edition of *The Catechism in Examples* of the Rev. D. Chisholm, Priest of the Diocese of Aberdeen. At least the first two volumes are issued, and the rest will follow. The method is one which has often been attempted with the teaching of catechisms, Protestant as well as Roman, but no one ever attempted it on such a scale. Every doctrine is stated, and then it is illustrated by incidents taken from the lives of the saints. But there is no way like it of teaching a catechism. And it teaches much besides the catechism. The two volumes published are (1) *Faith and the Creed*, (2) *Hope and Prayer* (3s. 6d. net each).

One of the Nobel prizes this year has gone to Jena. It has been awarded to Rudolf Eucken, Professor of Philosophy there. A year or two ago Dr. Boyce Gibson endeavoured to make known to Englishmen this original and suggestive German thinker. That effort is now ably supported by the translation of *The Life of the Spirit*, which has been issued by Messrs. Williams & Norgate in their Crown Series (5s.).

The Reverend Frank T. Lee has been through the Holy Land, noticing the lie of the hills and valleys and the customs of the inhabitants, and he has written *Sidelights on the Bible* (John C. Winston Co.). The old edition of Thomson's *Land and the Book* has it all, but who has the old edition of the *Land and the Book* now? And the three-volume edition is unworkable. So this little book will be appreciated.

The Symbolism of the Parables.

BY THE REV. R. M. LITHGOW, LISBON.

OUR studies in the synoptical records of Christ's parabolic doctrine have shown us that Matthew's is the historical and logical presentation of our Lord's teaching in this form, and that a full parallel to the series of parables here related is to be found in those recorded, without regard to their natural order, by Luke, while the few parables reported by Mark fit into and confirm the Matthean sequence. We have further seen that the parabolic doctrine, as set forth in Matthew's Gospel, is in keeping alike with the normal spiritual development in man, and with the course of our Lord's doctrine generally as this is given us in the first Gospel.

Another confirmatory aspect of that sequence of the parables which Matthew gives, with the developing doctrine which it embodies, may be found in the symbolism of the parables here successively set forth. Our attention has already been drawn in this direction, by the position which we found the Parable of the Net to occupy in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew's Gospel. Its appearance at the close of the opening series of parables there recorded, instead of in its more appropriate conjunction with the first two, we could best account for in view of the gradually ascending scale of natural figures made use of in the group of parables to which it belongs.

A very distinct encouragement to find some help in this quarter is given in the fact, that the three parables which alone appear alike in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and that in the same sequence in each, are characterized by this same gradation of their symbols. The first of these is that of the Sower, the essential point in the teachings of which is represented by a variety of soils. The second is that of the Mustard Seed, with its emblem drawn from the vegetable kingdom. The third is that of the Husbandmen, whose human qualities in this case give the point to its teachings.

But this reference suggests the need there is, as an essential preliminary to our present study, to find what one may call the common denominator in our Lord's parabolic teachings. It is quite clear that without this, we can steer no steady

course, nor arrive at any illumining conclusion on the subject we are now considering. If emblems which obviously stand for such varied elements in Christ's doctrine, as do the Sower, the Tares, and the Net, are to form the material for our study, and to be put in the same category, then we shall have a most inconsequent task to perform, without any hope whatever of a helpful result. We cannot, however, have given any attention to that development in the parabolic teaching, which Matthew's sequence of the parables presents, without feeling that this preliminary problem is by no means difficult to solve. It is clearly the soul, or man's spiritual nature, the possible developments and final issues of which are set before us here. And hence it is the several symbols by which this is represented that we must now keep in view.

One might say that this matter of the common denominator in the teachings of our Lord's parables is a very mariner's compass for the voyage upon which we are now embarked. One might indeed say even more, for in view of the strange confusion which the lack of it has caused, not only in the exposition, but in the very nomenclature of Christ's parables, one may be pardoned for thinking of it as the very orb of day. Under its light and guidance, our as yet obscure and dubious study becomes, like the dawn-illuminated world, at once interesting, suggestive, and instructive.

Of all the Matthean parables, it is in the first alone that we find this human soul symbolically represented in terms drawn from the realm of inert matter. This is done in the several figures of the rocky, trodden, weedy, and tilled soils. Only, too, in Luke's parallel Parable of the Lost Coin, have we another instance of a purely material emblem being employed for this purpose. These soils may have an owner, and that lost coin has had one, and in these implications lies the hopeful side of the two initial pictures. The other two Matthean parables, dealing with the great distinction, are both drawn, as regards their figures, from inanimate nature, these presenting us with the harvests of the land, and of the sea,

respectively in the Wheat and Tares, and in the Caught Fish, edible and unsound. The fish are utilized, not in their live and active, but in their dead and marketable, state. And so, too, the grain, whether we regard it as seed or crop, figures here passively, and in regard to its human value as worth the sowing, and wholesome for food. While these first three emblems alike are all of inanimate objects, their ascending gradation is marked by their being taken severally from the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal kingdoms.

We see something which looks like Matthew's use of our compass, if, because of its symbol the Fish being of a higher order than Mustard and Leaven, he gave those parables precedence of this one of the Net, and so removed it from its logical place. But we cannot credit him with much consistency or a very full intelligence in this matter, any more than we can in the case of some of his Old Testament quotations, in so far as concerns the parables of the Treasure and the Pearl. For these terms, which seem to regulate their place, in Matthew's record, do not denote the main subject of the parables. Our criticism here is, of course, conditional on the accuracy of our theory of the unifying parabolic factor.

The growth group of parables, to which Mark as well as Matthew makes contribution, and the two Matthean parables of which Luke also reports, draws all its emblems from the vegetable kingdom. It was in their passive aspect, and as objects of use and possession, that the natural symbols of the preceding group were set before us. But it is in their vital and more active aspect, that objects from the realm of nature are utilized to convey instruction in the group which deals with growth. Here, in the secretly Growing Corn, in the expansive outcome of the Mustard Seed, and in the wonderfully pervasive Leaven, it is the developing life of the plant world that is turned to account, for the setting forth of spiritual truth. The growth of the individual soul, of the Church of God, and of the Christian spirit are most suitably illustrated in the ripening, the enlarging, and the disseminating processes, identified with the vital development of the Corn, the Mustard, and the Leaven. But with these, the contributions made by the vegetable kingdom to the symbolism of the Matthean parables are brought to an end. This second group of parables is then, no less

than the first, marked by the special type of its emblems, while showing a distinct advance also in the character of these symbols.

Matthew's next group of parables presents us with the first set of human figures to be found in the parables he records. These are, a Treasure Finder, a Pearl Merchant, and an Upper Servant, who occupies at once the position of a forgiven debtor, and an unforgiving creditor. While the former two are gainers, respectively through chance discovery, and prudent trading, the last man figures alike as a gainer and a loser. The mark common to all is that they gain, severally a hidden treasure, a costly pearl, and the remission of an enormous debt. There is thus a distinct note of resemblance between all three, in keeping with the reference of all these parables to that blessing of grace, not only symbolized, but represented, in the last and expository parable of the group. The freedom of sovereign grace is well portrayed in that humanly uncontrollable aspect of fortune, or rather divine providence in life, which is made to dismiss or subordinate the thought of merit from the conduct of the parties brought before us here.

But if lacking here, the thought of duty and desert is a leading note in the parabolic figures of the succeeding group. These personifying labourers, sons, and husbandmen or tenants, have as their common feature that of men figuring in a dutiful relationship. From the engaged labourers, service is due in view of the pay they look for; from sons under the parental roof, the ready obedience of natural affection; and from the profitably occupied tenants, a just rent for the land on which, and by the fruits of which, they live. The whole scope of the divine claims on man is admirably expressed in the human symbolism of these parables.

There is an interesting and very suggestive character common to all the human figures in the concluding group of the parables recorded by Matthew. It is that of a complimentary relationship. The parties here figure as wedding guests, as bridesmaids, and as the trusted and honoured servants and agents of a great lord. It is not the call of duty, but of friendship, of intimacy, and of a confiding esteem, that has conferred upon them the positions they occupy, with the responsibilities these posts entail. While, too, the relationships and duties here depicted are natural enough, they are none of them such as come to

men by birth, or by mere engagement in the professional or commercial pursuits of life. They are all indicative of favour, or affection, at the hands of an exalted, noble, or loving friend. And just because of this, they are most fittingly employed to set forth the privileges and momentous responsibilities implied in man's acceptance of the divine grace.

Our survey of the symbolism of the Matthean parables has shown us that an ascending gradation of their figures marks their sequence in this Gospel. While the emblems of the earliest parables are furnished by inanimate objects, the symbolism of the last is supplied by individuals enjoying the pleasures, the honours, and the substantial rewards of life. But no less notable than this upward progression, are the marked distinctions characterizing the several groups, into which the development of the parabolic doctrine naturally divides them. Thus we have a group with emblems drawn from inanimate objects, dealing with the good and bad; a second about growth, illustrated from the vegetable kingdom; a third about grace, with emblems drawn from the sphere of human fortune; a fourth about the divine claims, and a fifth about the responsibilities of grace, illustrated respectively by the dutiful and complimentary relationships of life.

In order the more clearly to have these features of Matthew's parabolic record brought before us, we have reserved the consideration of the Lucan parables, but must now deal with them. In doing so, we shall follow that parallel with the Matthean sequence, which we have found it possible to compose from the parables which Luke reports. As this parallel, however, entails quite another arrangement of these parables than that of their order in Luke's Gospel, we can scarcely expect such distinct features here, as our study of the more historic Gospel has revealed. It will indeed be sufficiently satisfactory, if we find enough to confirm our parallel of these parables, with the logical arrangement, and grouping of those recorded in Matthew's Gospel.

The Lost Coin is the one parable in Luke's record in which the human soul is symbolized by a material object, and it is in these 'lost and found' parables that we find the equivalent of Matthew's initial group. The Parable of the Sower, also recorded by Luke, is the first alike in Mark and Matthew. But its parallel, this Parable of the Lost

Coin, besides occurring well on in Luke's Gospel, an unimportant matter, is immediately preceded there by that of the Lost Sheep. The reference of the three 'lost and found' parables to the several persons of the Trinity is not without its interest and expository value. And it may be, that a desire to give the Son's work its natural place, before that of the Holy Spirit, and the Heavenly Father, can account for the precedence given here to the living sheep over the inanimate coin, and the consequent departure of Luke from Matthew's sequence in the matter of these respective types of symbols. It is from the animal world that the second emblem in these parables is drawn, but in the third parable, that of the Prodigal Son, we find Christ's first figure taken from human life in the logical order of His parables. Luke's record thus attains to this stage of illustration earlier than either those of Matthew or Mark, but gives us herein the most hopeful element introduced by our Lord into His early teachings regarding man's natural state.

There is what answers to that passive aspect, in which the various emblems of Matthew's initial group of parables are looked at, in the fact that the lost coin, sheep, and son figure in these Lucan parables as all deprived of what has given them their natural value. The coin has lost its currency, the sheep its needful care, and the prodigal son his place in the family and in his father's house.

Luke's three parables on prayer, the means of spiritual growth, forming the natural parallel to Matthew's group on that subject, introduce us to as many distressed members of the human race. There is the Midnight Borrower, in want of bread for a visitor; the Importunate Widow, whose unprotected state exposes her to the neglect and despite of an unjust judge; and the Penitent Publican, whose earnest prayer for mercy presents such a striking contrast to the smug complacency of the self-righteous Pharisee. While representatives of humanity, these characters all figure in undesirable rôles, and remind us of life's sad and unfortunate side. If not, like the emblems of the last group, themselves lost, they each have something lacking which they need and wish to get. We note this, then, as a common feature in the symbolism of these three parables, and one which gives them a suitable place immediately before the Matthean group of parabolic finders.

These finders are recipients of grace, and Luke's parallel parables here deal with the manifestations of its possession, and of its lack. The Good Samaritan, and Two Debtors reveal more or less of grace in active operation, while Dives stands for the typically ungracious man. The relationship, in which the several personages of these parables stand to those they meet with, is distinctly a casual one, creating no more immediate duties than those of humanity and natural kindness. In this the figures here have their resemblance to those of Matthew's third group. There are debtors here, as there was one there, and there are those whom fortune favours and gives chances to, just as it did in the cases of the treasure finder and pearl merchant.

The distinctly dutiful relationship of Matthew's next group is also that of the equivalent parables of Luke's Gospel. In the Farm Servant, and in the royal servants set to trade with their master's Pounds, we have those whose duties are most obvious. The Barren Fig-tree, too, has in its own fashion its duties, in the way of bearing the fruit for which it is kept and attended to, and although alone among the imagery of the later parables, in being drawn from a lower realm than the human one, has had more vogue and currency, as depicting the useless man's cumbering of the ground, than the more intelligent and exalted Tenants of its Matthean parallel.

Just as with this fourth group, so with the fifth and last, a distinct feature, that of complimentary relationship, is common to the figures of Luke's and Matthew's parables. We have here, again, the guests bidden to a Great Supper, although all do not accept the gracious invitation; we have, too, a Steward so trusted that he is enabled to utilize his master's wealth for the benefit of his own personal

interests; and a Rich Fool, a favourite of fortune at any rate, if he be not one of wisdom's children. In all these cases, we have those so highly trusted and honoured, as to make it apparent, how fully the making or marring of their eternal fortunes is in their own hands. The divine goodness and grace at least have dealt benignly and most bountifully with them.

In the case of these parables from Luke's Gospel, affording as they do so fair a parallel to the Matthean sequence, we find enough of the same advancing symbolism to encourage that view of them which we have taken, and this in no respect more markedly than in those features distinguishing the several groups into which the developing doctrine here set forth most naturally divides them.

That development, as we have now traced it through the two advancing sets of symbolism presented in the Lucan and Matthean records, has brought us from the contemplation of its initial pictures of man's soul, as abandoned soil, and a lost coin, to see this same immortal spirit represented by figures proclaiming it as the honoured associate and trusted vicegerent of the Deity. Nor could the course of this development, alike on its symbolical and spiritual sides, be at once more natural, reasonable, significant, and inspiring. Nature's progressive advance through the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms up to man as its head, is here beautifully paralleled in that progress, which, starting from the rudimentary morality involved in the conscious distinction between right and wrong, passes through the apprehensive longings of spiritual growth, appreciative reception of grace, and consequent recognition of Godward duty, to the supreme responsibilities and glorious rewards of the divine fellowship and service.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, M.A., D.D., EDINBURGH.

The Argument.

THE passage which follows is not without high value, and there are depths of tenderness and pathos in it. But there is also a state of nerves in which the temper of both men is upon edge, and

the tone of the passage is less pleasant than is usual in the story. One wonders what Bunyan's reason may have been for introducing so apparently unnecessary and disagreeable an element, which deals with petty misunderstandings between great spirits. The answer must be that this daring

realist in homespun knows that that is the sort of thing that happens, and that many men find it more difficult to bear themselves like Christian gentlemen among little things than among great.

The trouble rises from a retort of Christian's, intended for a jest, but spoken in irritation. Hopeful's wonder that Little-faith did not sell or pawn his jewels called forth the announcement that Hopeful was talking like a chicken with its head in the shell. It was not a very brilliant piece of humour; but humour was not Christian's forte. He jokes clumsily, and sensitive people should keep out of the way of elephantine sport, whose weight is apt to impress them more than its brilliance. Those who incline to such facetiousness would do well to remember that its cost in friendship is often greater than its reward in amusement, and that afterwards it is apt to appear unmannerly.

Bunyan appears to be rather on the side of Christian in this episode, for his side-note in the original edition is 'Christian snubbeth his fellow for unadvised speaking.' Everybody knows how provoking a sensible man finds the fatuous remarks of one who has nothing to say and yet insists on speaking. Christian was one of those clever and serious men who 'cannot bear idiots,' and Hopeful's talk about selling the jewels struck him as mere stupidity—the sort of thing a man says without thinking of the meaning of his words.

Yet there is a deeper reason for the tartness than appears in that explanation. The jewels stand for all that a man has of worth and hope for eternity, and to sell them is to seal his doom for ever. It is one thing to be a coward and a weakling, but it is another thing to hold lightly the gift of eternal life. That it should have occurred to Hopeful even as a possibility that Little-faith should have sold his jewels,—that it seemed a quite natural thing for a man in his circumstances to do,—offended Christian's sense of proportion in spiritual things, and put a touch of temper into his reply. In this light the incident shows a particularly deep insight into character in the author.

Yet in spite of this, Hopeful's words are not so stupid as they seem. There are two arguments involved in Christian's impatient expostulation:—

1. *Nobody would value the jewels enough to buy them.* Men of the world esteem lightly the Christian's treasures, as the cock in the fable who

found a diamond and wished it were a grain of corn. But, as a matter of fact, though such men do not delight in the Christian's treasures, they do delight in seeing the Christian sell them. Little as they covet such spiritual wealth, it irritates them to see another man endowed with it; and his parting with it, by putting him on a level with themselves, appears to justify their poverty.

2. *The appalling loss which such parting with the jewels must involve, in excluding the seller from his eternal inheritance, is so great that no man would knowingly incur it.* But facts are again on the side of Hopeful. Spiritual suicide is not impossible; it is not even of rare occurrence. Had Bunyan thought of Spira he would have remembered a case in point. In times of dejection men often cast away all that is best in character and plunge recklessly into sin.

Thus it was not wholly Hopeful's fault that this conversation had become somewhat acrimonious. As Offor remarks, Hopeful is not the first to be 'almost angry' in an argument about the perseverance of the saints. And if it be asked why both of the men are in so bad a mood, Christian tart and Hopeful inclined to anger, we have only to recall familiar instances in our own experience, of nerves too highly strung and unexpected petty worries that easily rasp them, after a season of specially exalted religious communion. Christian ends the dangerous incident without apology, and Hopeful is big enough to accept his fellow's terms and 'pass that by,' without demanding the last word. So they pass from personalities to the abstract question in dispute. Yet Christian's subsequent exposition still shows a tendency to become personal, which a less gracious spirit than that of his friend might not unjustifiably have resented.

Esau.

The conversation passes on to that perennially interesting study, the character of Esau in contrast with that of the godly but imperfect man of faith. The usual contrast is between Esau and Jacob: here it is between Esau and Little-faith. The two types, thus standing over against Esau, have much in common. Both are comparatively dull and uninteresting, and each has moral peculiarities which compare unfavourably with the dashing figure of the huntsman, whose very sins have a

primitive picturesqueness about them which throws into all the meaner light the craftiness of Jacob and the pusillanimity of Little-faith. The late Professor A. B. Davidson had a very characteristic saying that 'There are some modern critics who prefer Esau to Jacob, and Saul to David, and Judas Iscariot to the Apostle John.' Possibly he may have referred to such a writer as Charles Kingsley, whose fellow-feeling for the sportsman led him to shield Esau from the general attack. Such men of letters as De Quincey and Ruskin, as well as many others, might be quoted as representatives of the same general tendency and point of view. Large-hearted and broad-minded humanists are apt to find the champions of a high spirituality too severe in their judgments of the natural man. There is much to be said on that side, and it is certainly wise to cultivate a habit rather of lenient than of severe judgments.

Yet Christian cannot be expected to make any such allowances. To him Esau is a wholly despicable character, a *cattiff*, and there is no more to be said. For Christian's mind is not a subtle one, nor, where the one grand issue is concerned, can he see any of the minor issues. For him the dividing line of life runs clear and unmistakable, the line between nature and grace, between the converted man and the unconverted. The lionizing of the natural man is but delusive trifling to him, whose eyes can never for a moment stray from that sharp and infinitely significant distinction. And if he had been taxed with any unfairness to the more interesting and brilliant aspects of the character of the natural man, he would have answered that in the end it is reality and depth that tell. For him, he is interested in the root of the matter, and all surface and showy things may well be left to take care of themselves.

Hopeful's Judgment of Little-faith.

Hopeful is hard on Little-faith. He himself is not a character of gigantic strength, but he has the imaginative delight in strength which is often found in the weak, and which sometimes keeps them from compassion. His very freshness and sunny geniality have their defects. His nature is a simple one, and his experience has been simple. In some respects he is but too like Little-faith, though the two are so opposite in others. Neither of them knows the world well, nor is deeply versed in the varieties of character and experience which it presents. They

are a pair of children, and Hopeful's judgment has all the unwitting harshness of a child's. For him, Little-faith's plight presents small difficulty. Had he been there he would have fought the three, who were evidently cowards, and of no account. It was this air of superiority to a good man who had been sorely pressed and had failed, that Christian found provoking. Perhaps John Bunyan, writing this passage, may have had in his mind some reminiscence of a great passage from his beloved volume, Luther upon Galatians (vi. 1), where he had read these sentences—'The kingdom whereunto ye are called is a kingdom not of terror or heaviness, but of boldness, joy, and gladness.' Yet, 'Paul, therefore, addeth this earnest admonition that the pastors should not be vigorous and unmerciful towards the offenders, or measure their own holiness by other men's sins.'

Christian's Judgment of Little-faith.

This is a rare and classical passage. The native chivalry of Christian rises in arms at once against anything that seems to be unfair or excessive censure even of a very sorry pilgrim. He remembers how unpopular such a type of character is, and how lonely his battles are therefore sure to be. No one came to this lonely and weak man's help, neither Great-grace nor any other of the King's champions, and it touches Christian's heart to think of him fighting alone, with neither aid nor sympathy. So he at once takes his part and does this vigorously all along. It is a most tender and sympathetic plea for the 'weak brother.' It must be confessed that such a plea is needed, for the weak brother is a very provoking person. Stevenson tells us that he is 'generally the most worthless of mankind,' and those who have wearied their souls in futile attempts to help him in spite of himself are tempted to acquiesce in the sweeping censure. But this man was after all 'only weak, not bad,' and in all Christian's defence we perceive a man whose pity is founded on a serious view and a serious experience of human life. He has felt and has not forgotten the supreme difficulty of being a strong and worthy character. So long as a man is trying for that, and going forward, in however uncouth or despicable a fashion, Christian will deal gently with him.

He never quite admits his rudeness to Hopeful, but he has not forgotten his friend's reminder, and here and there one can perceive him finding it a

little difficult to be courteous, and yet trying to keep his speech in check. It was hardly becoming in one who had recently lived through the experiences of Doubting Castle and its grounds to condemn a weak brother so uncompromisingly as Hopeful did, and an obvious retort was open to Christian. But he suppresses that, and passes on to more worthy lines of speech.

His plea for the weak brother is long and somewhat discursive, repeating some of its arguments as is the way of a man in an hour of expansive talk. But the entire discourse moves between two points well worth noting and remembering. These are (1) his sense of danger; (2) his allowance for the limitations of the weak one.

1. *His sense of danger.* He knows the terrible power of these assailants. It is all very well, from the point of view of a distant onlooker, to say how the battle might have been better fought. It is quite true that Faint-heart, Mistrust, and Guilt were cowards after all is said. But yet they are hard to fight and conquer for all that. It is cheap to underrate another man's conflict, as many passages from Rudyard Kipling's songs and stories of soldiers remind us. It is a different thing to stand up face to face with even such despicable enemies and to play the man.

Besides, these enemies are but 'journeyman thieves,' and all the powers of hell are at their whistle. To John Bunyan, as to Martin Luther, the devil is alive and personal with a vengeance, and 'he is never out of hearing.' We would refer again to Professor Masson's well-known essay on *The Three Devils*—an essay which every reader of the *Pilgrim's Progress* should study. This personal agency and power of Satan and his hosts was a thought that haunted Bunyan, and gave their significance for him to all departments of experience. And certainly, whether one is prepared to accept John Bunyan's demonology or not, the fact which these recurring words express is but too familiar to us all. In times when mistrust and the sense of guilt have got at the spirit, a whole host of temptations usually come to back them, and whatever the explanation be, the fact is terrible enough.

What gives point and earnestness to Christian's speech is the fact that he himself has had to fight these enemies. The reference is probably to the Valley of the Shadow of Death, which Christian is not likely soon to forget, and to the previous

fight with Apollyon. His armour had all been needed to save his life that day—what wonder if he pities the plight of this unarmed pilgrim? His armour had been necessary, yet such armour is a challenge to the enemy; and he cannot but feel an additional compassion for this simple and quiet traveller, challenging nobody, and only desiring to lead a gentle life, yet so cruelly and gratuitously assaulted. 'He laughs at scars who never felt a wound,' and young and callow Christians are often more severe as judges than those who are, in Patrick Walker's covenanting language, 'Exercised, painful, and disciplined believers.' In the famous passage about 'such footmen as thou and I are,' which follows the description of Job's horse, Bunyan has said the last word that the Christian heart needs to hear upon this subject. He himself could speak in this line from experience. He had been a soldier in the Civil War, and he had a soldier's fear of battle. If we want to get at the truth of actual war, it is not to the imagination of poets or of arm-chair critics that we go. For the full horror of battle, we turn to such a book as Lord Roberts' *Forty Years in India*. And for the true estimate and account of spiritual conflict also, we may well turn to Bunyan as to one who knows. None of all God's wise men has made a more systematic or constant habit of turning experience into conviction, and gathering insight into the things of God, and compassion for his fellowmen, from his own conflicts with the devil.

A further point which emphasizes the sense of danger, is the remarkable passage about Great-grace, and the difficulty which even he had found in this encounter. We had taken it for granted, from the fact that the thieves fled upon the mere rumour of him, that this must be one of those unconquered men—heroes that had never known defeat, or even been compelled to take their fighting seriously. One of our great Scottish stories is that of him who, carrying a famous heart for burial in Palestine, by way of Spain, was passing through Seville. A Spanish knight, noticing that his face was free from the marks of wounds, asked him in wonder how that had come to pass, and received the answer that all his life his hands had been able to keep his cheeks from scars. Such had not, however, been the fortune of Great-grace, as the 'scars and cuts' upon it gave demonstration. He can manage his weapons excellently as long as he can keep his enemy at sword's point

distance, but once the enemy gets 'within,' the chances are against even Great-grace. At close grips, even he is no more invulnerable than other men, and we hear a distant sound of moaning and groaning and roaring from far-off centuries, heard distinctly still across so great a gulf of time. It is Great-grace, whom his foe has got *within* his sword-play—Great-grace in the person of Paul, and David, and Heman, and Hezekiah, and Peter. Who that has heard that sound, and lifting up his eyes has caught sight of all those scarred faces of the older world, will forget the sight, or will ever again speak foolishly in the style of Hopeful?

2. *Christian's allowance for the limitations of the weak brother.* He reminds Hopeful that the natural build and disposition of a man must be taken into account in judging others. In character as in physique there are limitations beyond which it is impossible for a man to go. To expect Little-faith to show the mettle of Great-grace would be to blame a wren for not displaying the strength of an ox. This is especially relevant in the matter of courage, which is largely a physical and constitutional quality. This is not a champion, and he never will nor can be one. He is not a great man nor a hero of any kind. Fortunately this does not deliver him from being one of God's true pilgrims. We cannot all be champions, and from such men this is not expected. The passage reminds us of Thomas à Kempis: 'Thou art a man, and not God; thou art flesh, not an angel. How canst thou look to continue always in the same state of virtue, when an angel in heaven hath fallen, as also the first man in Paradise?' It is but this exposition of the Scriptural assurance that a man shall be judged according to that he hath, and not according to that he hath not.

It is a kindly doctrine, and full of the consideration and compassion of Christ. Yet it is only for some men that it is legitimate, and it is often taken advantage of by those who have no right to it. There is a curious anticipation of Darwin in the sentences, 'Some are strong, some are weak . . . this man was one of the weak, and therefore he "went to the wall."' The steadily increasing acceptance with which the doctrine of evolution has met from the modern mind has been one of the most illuminative influences in our times. But undoubtedly one of the dangerous elements which it has brought in with it is a tendency to fatalism consequent upon a too exclusive attention

to the doctrine of natural selection and the survival of the fittest. The weak are apt to excuse themselves from effort on the plea of this weakness, until a fatalistic paralysis of will and distrust of their powers sets them wholly at the mercy of outward circumstances and inward moods. So much is this the case that one becomes almost afraid to show any compassion for the weak brother, or to acknowledge the fact of his constitutional weakness, lest he trade upon the sympathy and cease to strive.

The tenderness of Christian,¹ however, is, as Dr. Kerr Bain points out, rested not upon a sentimental but upon a moral basis. The tenderness is based on Christian's good opinion of the man, not the good opinion based on the tenderness. He is no Great-heart, but he is an emphatically good man—a man of genuine and sincere character. That is what appeals to Christian, and enlists his strong regard. In spite of his begging, and his lifelong grievance, Christian cannot forget that he was still going forward even while he begged and complained. Cheever finely says in this connexion that 'God brings not a pair of scales to weigh your graces, and if they be too light refuse them: but He brings a touch-stone to try them, and if they be pure gold, though ever so little of it, it will pass current with Him.'

The whole passage has been aptly called 'a monologue on Christian tenderness,' and it has been remarked that the effect of it is strengthened by the fact that the story is not part of his actual experience, but only a matter of hearsay to him. This subtle touch given by throwing the passage into indirect history, adds to our sense of Christian's chivalrous nature. His habit is to speak kindly of those who are in fault. 'If ever there be a shade of harshness in Christian when he is face to face with (false pilgrims), it is well to note that there is little trace of this, but oftener a tone of lowly charity, when he is speaking of them to others.' There is an old story, told by that curious moralist Mr. Todd, in his once famous *Students' Manual*, of a man who habitually stayed to the end of any gathering in which he happened to be. When asked his reason for always being the last to leave the room, he replied that it was because he had noticed that the talk always went against the person who had just gone from the company.

¹ Compare the fine passages on this subject in Dr. Kerr Bain's first volume, pp. 428, 430, etc.

Christian is never seen in a better light than in his defence of an absent brother.

The descriptions of Leviathan and Job's horse are introduced in a somewhat odd fashion. The former is understood by Bunyan as a symbol of the devil, while the latter is apparently irresistible from its sheer literary strength and vividness. From the Book of Enoch downwards, these picturesque passages have tempted the allegorist; and, as Ewald says, 'the strangest things have been imported into the description.' Job is a wonderful piece of writing even as a book of nature. It touches upon the ways of many birds and beasts, among which are the war-horse and the Egyptian crocodile; which, as Leviathan, we see here on its way towards those many conceptions of dragons which delighted the imagination of the Middle Ages. In the Book of Job the argument is simply, 'If the creature God has created be so terrible, who will stand before God who has created him?' Bunyan does not pause to define the original meaning or connexion of these brilliant descriptions. It is their brilliance that has fascinated his ear and eye, and he brings them

in because he enjoys them so. In the notes to Professor A. B. Davidson's Commentary on Job there is a remarkable rendering of Renan's translation of the two passages, which is well worth reading.

It is well for us that the happy thought of introducing these figures occurred to Bunyan, for it led him to the closing passage of the whole narrative of the discussion—undoubtedly one of the finest pieces of writing that ever came from his pen. The author of *The Heavenly Footman* gives us his plea for humility in 'such footmen as thou and I are.' It needs no comment, and once read it can never be forgotten. It is a masterpiece of appreciation of a soldier's humility. And it closes with two practical advices which sum up the moral of the entire story. First, never to go out unharnessed, and especially never to leave one's shield behind. Second, never to go alone. And the latter advice falls back into the teaching of the 23rd Psalm, 'I will fear no evil; for thou art with me.' The ultimate defence of every Christian man is the presence of God with his soul. No wonder if that closing note breaks out into Bunyan's most unrestrained eloquence.

The International Critical Commentary on 'Esther.'¹

By REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., ABERDEEN.

THE most diverse opinions have been held about the Book of Esther. No book of the Bible has secured a stronger hold on the affections of Jews, none has been more repugnant to the feelings of Christians. Luther uttered a characteristically hostile judgment regarding it, and it would be a real relief to many if the book had never obtained admittance to the Canon. Yet, in spite of many objectionable features, and the absence of any positive moral or religious value, the Book of Esther possesses significance for the study both of Judaism and of Comparative Religion; and even the ordinary reader of Scripture may study it with profit if he apprehends its standpoint and aim. To guide him

to the latter he will find a welcome aid in Professor Paton's Commentary, regarding which we have no hesitation in saying that it is the first work of the kind which has made it possible for English-speaking students to understand the Book of Esther.

After treating of the place of Esther in the Hebrew Bible and in the Septuagint, respectively, Professor Paton deals at length with the text. The special feature in this department is the presence in the Versions (LXX, Old Lat., Vulg., Pesh.), Josephus, the Talmud, and Targums, of a number of remarkable additions to the Massoretic text. These additions, which have hitherto not been readily accessible to the student, have been collected by Dr. Paton, and introduced (in translation) at the appropriate places in the Commentary. In this he has certainly rendered a valuable service, and has added materially to the interest of his pages. Passing to the sphere of

¹ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther.* By Lewis Bayles Paton, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of O.T. Exegesis and Criticism, Hartford Theol. Seminary, Hartford, Conn. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908. Price 10s. 6d.

'Higher Criticism,' our author first gives an outline of the book, and then proceeds to discuss the identity of Ahasuerus, by whom the writer is shown, beyond all reasonable doubt, to have intended Xerxes. The purpose of the book is 'to commend the observance of the feast of Purim, by an account of the way in which this feast originated.' There has never been much controversy about the unity of the larger part of the book, but reasonable doubts have been expressed as to whether the section 9²⁰-10³ comes from the same hand as the rest of the narrative. The reader will find this question carefully discussed by Professor Paton. Little difference of opinion prevails as to the propriety of assigning the date of the book to the Greek period, and, as our author shows, the later part of that period has stronger claims in its favour than the earlier. The author was certainly a Jew, and, it is suggested, may have come from Persia to reside in Judæa. The historical character of the book is subjected to a careful examination, as the result of which 'the conclusions seem inevitable that the Book of Esther is not historical, and that it is doubtful whether even a historical kernel underlies its narrative.'

Owing to the importance of the Feast of Purim in the Book of Esther and in later Judaism, one turns with interest to Professor Paton's examination (p. 77 ff.) of theories of the origin of this feast. The various theories of a Jewish origin (theories which, from widely differing standpoints

and for very different reasons, can claim in their support names like Bleek, J. D. Michaelis, Cheyne, Johns, P. Haupt) are pronounced unsatisfactory. Nor will a Greek origin meet the case. Much more plausibility belongs to theories of a Persian or a Babylonian origin. Here we meet with Lagarde's and Schwally's identification of *Purim* with the Pers. *Farwardigān*, which Dr. Paton is disposed to question. More striking are the attempts of Jensen and others to connect Purim with Babylonia, and to find the prototype of the story of Esther in the Gilgamesh Epic. Dr. Paton's conclusion, after a survey of all the various theories, is that, 'while the feast of Purim is probably borrowed either directly from Babylonia, or indirectly by way of Persia, no certainty has yet been reached as to the precise Babylonian feast from which it is derived.'

The next sections deal with the canonicity (where attention is called to the well-known absence of the name of God, and to characteristic Jewish attempts to evade this damaging admission) and the interpretation of the book (where all the relevant literature is catalogued); and then comes the Commentary proper, which for clearness and good sense leaves nothing to be desired. Last but not least come the three indexes, which will materially facilitate the use of the Commentary and add to its value. These include: (1) Hebrew words; (2) names of authors and books cited; (3) subjects; (4) Biblical passages.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF DEUTERONOMY.

DEUTERONOMY xxxiii. 27.

The eternal God is thy dwelling-place,
And underneath are the everlasting arms.

EXPOSITION.

'The eternal God.'—The God of *old*, literally *aforetime*. The word denotes what is ancient rather than what is eternal. It is often used of the Mosaic age, or other distant periods of Israel's past (Ps 44¹ 74^{2, 12}, Is 51⁹, Mic 7²⁰), and even of a former period of a single lifetime (Job 29²). It is used also of mountains (Dt 33¹⁵), the heavens (Ps 68³³). Besides the present text it is used of God in Hab 1¹², Ps 55¹⁹ (where the R.V. is 'he that abideth of old').—DRIVER.

'Thy dwelling-place.'—The word 'thy' is not represented in the original [Driver accordingly has the more general translation, 'a dwelling-place']. The word translated 'refuge' in A.V. is a feminine form of the word translated 'dwelling-place' in Ps 90¹, 'Lord, thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations.' That Psalm is also attributed to Moses, the man of God. The same word is used of the 'habitation of Jehovah' in heaven (Dt 26¹⁵).—WALLER.

'Underneath are the everlasting arms.'—Not only is God a dwelling-place for His people, He is also their unfailing support. His almighty arms are ever beneath them, bearing them up, and sustaining them, alike in their prosperity and in their need. For the figure, see Hos 11³, Is 33² 51⁵, Ps 44⁴ 89²².—DRIVER.

THE SERMON.

The Eternal God thy Refuge.

By the Rev. John Hunter, D.D.

I. This text is one of the loftiest utterances of Hebrew religion. Its great assurance was most fitting and inspiring under the circumstances in which it was first given. The children of Israel were about to lose the presence and guidance of Moses. He was leaving them, he said, but he was leaving them with God.

II. Given by Moses as a promise to his people, it was also the assurance in the strength of which he himself met the supreme moment of his life, and in dying conquered death. His strong wish in that hour was to be alone—alone with nature, alone with God. As he leaves the society of his fellows, the noise of the camp for the silence of the mountain-top, from which he is to come down again no more, we hear him saying not only to his people, but to his own soul: 'The Eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.'

III. Is it the expression of the faith of only a few souls of exceptional devoutness? No. These ancient words interpret a universal and indestructible need of humanity. We have outgrown some of the needs of ancient Israel, and we have new needs of our own. But we have not done away with sorrow and sin. We have not outgrown the need of Divine protection. Sooner or later of all substitutes for God a man says, 'Miserable comforters are ye all.' Religion is God; God is religion.

IV. To bring men to find refuge in eternal God is the purpose of all Divine revelation, discipline, and teaching, and of all Christian ministries. In the Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul twice calls Moses a mediator. He is the minister of God to bring men to rest in Him. This is what Emerson meant when he wrote:

O friend, my bosom said,
Through thee alone the sky is arched,
Through thee the rose is red;
All things through thee take nobler form,
And look beyond the earth:
Me, too, thy nobleness has taught
To master my despair;
The fountains of my hidden life
Are through thy friendship fair.

V. But there is a higher mediator than Moses. There is One whose supreme office it is to make

the eternal God our refuge. He came forth from God to lead us to God. He lived and died that our faith and hope might be in God. His love is the assurance of the Divine love. His sufferings and death are the revelation, in time and space, of the eternal passion and sacrifice of God.

The Consolation of the Bereaved.

By the Very Rev. J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

What consolations can we offer that will nerve the hearts of rich as well as poor to bear the burdens of life and especially the agony of bereavement?

I. First, there springs to our lips the great key-word that more than any other interprets the mystery of our human life—the word SACRIFICE. Of one who has seen his comrade fall by his side, the poet-primate of Armagh sings:

And thoughts beyond his thoughts the Spirit lent,
And manly tears made mist upon his eyes;
And to him came a great presentiment
Of high self-sacrifice.

But there is not only the sacrifice of him who falls. Look at that mother who kisses her boy for the last time, and commends him to God. He is her sacrifice. There is a joy in having been allowed to give.

II. This consolation were true even if death closed the story, even if there were no recognitions and restorations in another world. This is a true consolation; for sacrifice does not barter. But though it does not look for wages, it obtains its reward. The other great word of consolation is RESURRECTION. We cannot prove it, but we know that we shall not wholly die. And then there is the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the nearest thing to a logical proof that we can conceive of. We know because Christ has brought life and immortality to light by the gospel.

III. But where is consolation to be found for those whose loved ones have been plunged unprepared into eternity? In face of this question I dare solemnly to repeat the words of our text: 'The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.' For what does it mean to have crossed the narrow stream?

1. It does not mean a wholly new beginning. There is no break in character.

I looked behind to find my past,
And, lo, it had gone before.

2. Nor does it mean an absolute fixity. I cannot believe the theory—for it is but a theory—that the moment of physical death is the moment in which a man's state is eternally and unalterably fixed. I cannot find that in my Bible: all nature, all analogy is against it. It cannot be.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

'Underneath.'—May I give you an incident which I heard a father tell of his little child whom he dearly loved, and who was his everyday companion? One night word was brought to him that the child seemed restless and troubled, and was moaning in her sleep as if in pain. He went up to her room, and found it was as he had been told. He quietly approached the bed, put his arm under his child, and she fell back at once into an untroubled, peaceful sleep. Thinking that she had wakened for an instant, and then had gone to sleep, knowing that he was near her, after a while he left her as quietly as he came. In the morning, when he questioned the child, she had no knowledge that he had been in the room. Yet the presence of love was there, unknown, but felt; unconsciously realized, but realized.

JOSEPH N. BLANCHARD.

A minister was requested to visit a sick girl who lived alone with her mother in a small apartment. The family was evidently poor, but not in need, save of comfort and friendship. The daughter was an art student; but she was a frail little body, with a weakness of lungs that had always threatened a short life. She had taken cold, and was now very sick. The minister talked and prayed in the hope that he might give them a feeling of friendship in their loneliness and of hope in their sorrow. This he succeeded in doing; but the incident which made the deepest impression upon the sick girl, and, through her, upon the minister himself, was something very light and wholly unpremeditated. He noticed that the girl looked most uncomfortable as she lay propped up in bed. The pillows had sagged, and she had slipped down until her position seemed anything but restful. 'Let me lift you into a little more comfortable position,' said the minister. He lifted her easily, for she was frail and he was strong. While he held her clear of the bed, he directed the mother to draw the sheet tight and tuck it under without wrinkles, and to shake and turn the pillows and place them on the other side of the bed. Then he laid the girl back upon the cool side of the bed, on the freshly turned pillows, and she fell asleep. A nurse was arranged for, and though she did her work faithfully and well, she never quite succeeded in bringing back the sensation of that first day. The minister did not see the girl again until he came to attend the funeral, but both the mother and the nurse told him how, every day, she had recalled the feeling of comfort and of peace with which she lay back on the pillows on the occasion of his visit to them. 'There was such a sense of comfort and security,' she said, 'to be lifted up by some one so strong that it seemed no strain, and to be laid back so gently. I never had such a feeling of perfect peace, and it made me think of the uplifting strength of my Heavenly Father.'

My Refuge.—The late Rev. C. H. Spurgeon in the *Treasury of David* refers to a personal incident which had a great effect upon his mind. 'In the year 1854, when I had scarcely been in London twelve months, the neighbourhood in which I laboured was visited by Asiatic cholera, and my congregation suffered from its inroads. Family after family summoned me to the bedside of the smitten, and almost every day I was called to visit the grave. I gave myself up with youthful ardour to the visitation of the sick, and was sent for from all corners of the district by persons of all ranks and religions. I became weary in body, and sick at heart. My friends seemed failing one by one, and I felt or fancied that I was sickening like those around me. A little more work and weeping would have laid me low amongst the rest; I felt that my burden was heavier than I could bear, and I was ready to sink under it. As God would have it, I was returning mournfully home from a funeral, when my curiosity led me to read a paper which was wafered up in a shoemaker's window in the Dover Road. It did not look like a trade announcement, nor was it, for it bore in a good handwriting these words: "*Because thou hast made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the Most High, thy habitation, there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come near thy dwelling.*" The effect upon my heart was immediate. Faith appropriated the passage as her own. I felt secure, refreshed, *girt with immortality*. I went on with my visitation of the dying, in a calm and peaceful spirit. I felt no fear, and suffered no harm.' From the moment he felt that the eternal God was his dwelling-place, and underneath were the everlasting arms, he felt that all was right.

'The everlasting arms.'—I like that dream of Josephine Butler's, when her life passed into deep shadow, amid many frowning and threatening besetments: 'I thought I was lying flat, with a restful feeling, on a smooth, still sea, a boundless ocean, with no limit or shore on any side. It was strong and held me up, and there was light and sunshine all around me. And I heard a voice say, "Such is the grace of God!"' Let the Church even dimly realize the force of this tremendous ally, and she will move with a strength and quietness which will give her the secret of perpetual conquest.—J. H. JOWETT.

In His arms.—John Burns occupies a humble place in the world of men, for he is poor, and only a policeman, in a section of a great city where vice is rampant. In his home there has been much to dishearten, but a confident trust in Divine providence lightens all his burdens. One morning I hailed him with friendly inquiries about his loved ones. He told me of the sickness of his daughter, dangerous, costly, and of the illness of his wife that bore as great a weight on his thought, together with the struggle to keep out of the clutches of debt. 'But through it all,' he said, 'God takes care of me and bears me up. This morning in front of the drug store there at the corner, I came upon a drunken man who had found a sparrow, just a little one that had fallen out of its nest somehow. The man said he was just playing with the little thing, but I saw he didn't know how rough he was, and that he would surely kill it. I tried to get him to give me the poor bird, but he wouldn't give it up, and kept on saying that I could have it when he was done

playing with it. Maybe he didn't intend any harm, but the sparrow kept crying so loud, I begged and begged until the man gave the little bird to me. Then I took it, and put it in one of my big hands, and put the other one over it. And don't you know, just as soon as I did, the bird seemed to know that it was safe, and it began to sing as bravely as it could. This made me happy, and as I walked through the store to find a place where I could put the sparrow out of the reach of the cats, with the poor bird singing so joyously all the time because I was protecting it, I thought that God took care of me, just as I carried that little bird. And I prayed that He would always hold me in His arms just as I had that sparrow in my hands.'

FOR REFERENCE.

- Cuyler (T. L.), *Everyday Religion*, 130.
 Darlow (T. H.), *The Upward Calling*, 154.
 Hunter (J.), *De Profundis Clamavi*, 310.
 Parks (L.), *The Winning of the Soul*, 201.
 Robinson (J. Armitage), *Holy Ground*, I, 15.
 Robinson (J. Armitage), *Unity in Christ*, 123, 137.
 Smellie (A.), *In the Secret Place*, 345.
 Wardell (R. J.), *Studies in Homiletics*, 94.
Christian World Pulpit, xxix. 209, (F. W. Farrar); lv. 4
 (C. S. Horne); lxxviii. 401 (J. Hunter).

Contributions and Comments.

Christianity and Mythology.

IN the December number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES reference is made to Mr. J. M. Robertson's lecture in Glasgow on 'Christianity and Mythology.' Do British ministers of religion really understand that the R.P.A. is making the most desperate attempt to destroy in the minds of the young all belief in Christianity? Much of their literature is puerile, and carries its own condemnation with it to all really thoughtful people. But much of it is subtle—unscrupulously subtle—and appears to be convincing and unanswerable.

I refer chiefly to the parallels which Rationalists draw between 'Pagan Christs' and the Christ of the gospel. Mr. Robertson sets forth a great array of virgin births, resurrections, ascensions, and the like, all in pre-Christian times, with the expressed intention of proving that Christianity is nothing more than Mithraism, etc., under another form, and that its chief figure is purely mythical.

We may smile at all this, but the educated youth of our time are being smitten with it, and their faith often perishes. *This needs answering*, not with invective nor contempt, but with facts, critically set forth. The principles of criticism have been applied to the Bible; they need applying to the stories of Mr. Robertson. This mass of legend, alleged to be the source of Christianity, needs subjecting to a rigorous examination by competent scholars. All the *facts* adduced by Mr. Robertson must be cheerfully admitted, but his deductions from them must be critically repudiated. Who is to do this work? It must be done, and that at once. While we sleep the enemy is busy

sowing the tares. The average overworked pastor cannot do this work. It must be done for him by leisured scholars. It is an urgent and imperative duty. And here let me say that the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* is a veritable gold mine.

FREDERIC C. SPURR.

Old Kent Road, London.

St. John i. 41.

I.

I DESIRE to call attention to a very interesting variant in the Syriac of Jn 1⁴¹ in the Sinai Palimpsest, which is corroborated by three of the Old Latin manuscripts. And I have little hesitation in saying that it probably restores to us the original reading.

Dr. Burkitt has translated the passage, 'And he, Andrew, saw Simon his brother on that day, and saith unto him: "My brother, we have found the Messiah."' My own translation, published in 1896, is nearly the same, for I followed the transcript of the Syriac text on that page made by Dr. Burkitt in 1893, which said: [ܡܠܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ] 'in that day.' The brackets have disappeared from the first word in his new edition of the Cureton text, where it is given as one of the Sinai variants.

My photograph of that page, taken in 1892, shows clearly that this is wrong. The first word of each short line, in that column, appears on the margin of the later script (the *Lives of Holy Women*), and in this case the word is blurred by

dirt. Hence the brackets. But out of the dirt there appears, in the photo, the last letter of a word, **ⲟ**. After the **ⲟ** there is no **ⲟ**, and the next word is **ⲡⲓⲙⲁⲛⲉ**. This gives the reading 'of the day,' the **ⲡ** being clearly legible.

Dr. Burkitt cannot therefore have got the two words from my photograph. He copied it from the MS. as **ⲡⲓⲙⲁⲛⲉ ⲟ[ⲟⲛ]**, and the MS., during my sixth visit to Sinai in 1906, has told me a different story.

I touched the margin with the re-agent. To my great surprise, there came up clearly the word **ⲟⲩⲁⲛⲉ**, 'at the dawn.' The next word needed no chemical treatment, for even in 1892 it reproduced itself in my photograph as **ⲡⲓⲙⲁⲛⲉ**, 'of the day.'

I communicated this, along with other emendations, shortly after my return home, to several Syriac scholars. It attracted no particular attention, however, till quite lately. As the sheets of my new edition of the Sinai Gospels were passing through the press, I printed on the page containing Jn 1⁴¹ corroborations which I had found in the published text of two Old Latin MSS, the Codex Veronensis (*δ*):

'Inuenit autem mane fratrem Simonem et dixit illi: Inuenimus Messiam.'

and the Codex Palatinus (*ε*):

'Et mane inuenit fratrem suum simonem et ait illi inuenimus messia.'

It becomes at once evident that behind the Syriac of the Sinai Palimpsest, and behind the Latin of *δ* and *ε*, stood the same Greek word **πρωῖ**, which an early copyist mistook for **πρωτον**. Hence we have 'Andrew first findeth his brother Simon, and saith unto him,' etc.

That the new reading is a good one goes almost without saying. Read vv. 40-41 either in the English version or in the Greek text, substituting **πρωῖ** for **πρωτον**, or 'at the dawn of the day,' i.e. 'in the morning,' for 'first,' and you will see that the chronological sequence becomes correct. 'On that day,' would be hardly natural; for if the meeting between the brothers took place some considerable time after the tenth hour, the word 'evening' would have been used. Dr. Nestle at once advised me to ascertain if there is not a similar reading in the Old Latin Codex Usanianus (*1*). I examined the text of Dr. Abbott's edition (1884), and found that the page which contains Jn 1⁴¹ is

imperfect, the first syllable of every line having disappeared, but before 'fratrem suum' stands printed the letter *e*, showing that the missing word was *mane*, not *primum*. I thereupon wrote to Professor Wilkins of Trinity College, Dublin, requesting him to examine the manuscript, and to see if he could not detect any further trace of *mane*.

Professor Wilkins did so, in company with the editor, Dr. Abbott. To their great regret they found that the *e* has disappeared, the edge of the leaf being very crumbly. But Dr. Abbott is certain that it *was* there when he copied it. He formed no theory as to what word it stood for.

How did a copyist mistake **πρωῖ** for **πρωτον**? At first we thought that there might have been a contraction (either in the original or in an early copy), which was wrongly expanded into **πρωτον**. I imagined that the *ι* of **πρωῖ** might have been written so close beneath the *ω*, as to be mistaken for a *τ*. But I am told that *iota subscriptum* is never found in early MSS.

Dr. Wilkins has made the plausible suggestion, that the copyist who made the mistake read the dots over an uncial *ι* as the upper stroke of a *τ*. Having once written **πρωτ**, he was almost obliged to add *ον* to make sense out of it.

If the reading **πρωῖ** be in truth the original one, some very interesting questions occur to us. i. Was the Sacred Autograph written in an uncial script, or in a cursive? Papyrus and vellum would doubtless be costly. The Evangelists and the Apostles were men of slender means; it is therefore permissible to think that if they used uncials, these must have been very small ones.

ii. If so curious a mistake as **πρωτον** for **πρωῖ** crept into the Gospel text before the fourth century, may not the same kind of accident account for small discrepancies between the four records of our Lord's life? and may there not be similar mistakes still undetected in the text of the Gospels?

It must be remembered that Codex Veronensis and Codex Palatinus both belong to either the fourth or the fifth century. Their claim to a high antiquity is therefore quite as good as that of the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus; and they are translations into Latin from still older MSS not now extant. The same may be said of the Syriac palimpsest on Mount Sinai, which is probably the earliest translation of the Gospels into any

language. It is indeed marvellous that we should thus be able to get behind the oldest of Greek texts, and to detect its slight corruptions.

But how does this affect the question of inspiration? If we believe that the New Testament was dictated, word for word, by the Holy Spirit, it would of course be fatal. But such verbal dictation is out of harmony with God's other ways of working. His gifts to man are like the pure water springing up in the mountains, or like the pure air which man has the power to preserve pure, or to taint. No special providence watched over the copyists. Both the Old and the New Testaments are records of the revelation of Himself which God made to man gradually, as man was able to receive it. Our faith in its moral teaching is therefore not shaken by any mistakes of copyists, nor even by mistakes, if there are any, of the inspired Recorders.

There are some men who expect absolute accuracy from the Protomartyr Stephen, quite forgetting that he spoke in the midst of a wild and angry crowd, most of whom held in their hands the stones which they were impatient to throw at his head. And the men who copied the Gospels did not always work in the seclusion of a college library, nor even in that of a monastic cell. They were doubtless, many of them, those of whom the world was not worthy; who, we are told in the Epistle to the Hebrews, dwelt in dens and caves of the earth. Possibly, in the second and the third century, the blood-stained sheep-skin cloak of some martyr scribe was carefully turned into parchment, for the reception of those words of life which its owner had died to preserve for us.

AGNES SMITH LEWIS.

Cambridge.

II.

With regard to *πρωί* versus *πρωτον* in Jn 1⁴¹, it is interesting to note that in the *Odyssey* (xxiv. 28) *πρωί* has been restored instead of *πρωτα*, the vulgar reading, by Kayser, Ameis, La Roche, Faesi, and Monro. This is a case very closely parallel with ours.

I think the autograph may have been written in such small and very neat uncials as those of the papyrus of Hyperides, of which Dr. Kenyon gives a facsimile in Plate II. of his 'Classical Texts, from Papyri in the British Museum, with autotype facsimiles of MSS' (1891), and which he dates as

'very early, and perhaps of the 2nd century B.C.' There in the middle column, in the second and third lines (*et passim*), you will find *iota* and *tau* written thus :

ι (like a J) τ (like a J).

The little toes turned westward in each case being exactly similar, so that *πρωι* and *πρωτον* might easily be mistaken.

If such a dainty-toed iota had two dots written above it, it would pass for a tau anywhere.

Of course, defenders of *πρωτον* could easily say that the Sinai Palimpsest and the three Latin Codices omitted *τον* after *πρω* by an error of haplography or ablepsia; but *πρωί* is the harder reading, and therefore the more likely to be original. And *πρωί* will account for the variants *πρωτος* and *πρωτον*; the scribe of *Σ*, finding what he mistook for *πρωτ* gave it a termination in agreement with the subject of the verb, *οὗτος*; while the scribe of *A* gave it a termination in agreement with the object of the verb, *τὸν ἀδελφόν*.

GEORGE WILKINS.

Trinity College, Dublin.

Yahû or Yahw?

It is well known that the original pronunciation of the name Jehovah has long been lost. The Jews substitute for it the term '*Ādhōnāy*' ('My Lords,' a *plur. majestatis*); and our word 'Jehovah' (*Yḥōwāh*) is a curious hybrid representing the Massoretic combination of the consonants of the original term (YHWH) with the half-vowel and the two full vowels of the substituted term [יהוה, = אדני, יהוה]. If '*Ādhōnāy*' occurs along with *Yhwh*, the latter is pronounced with the vowels of '*Ēlōhīm*', thus *Yēhōwih* (יהוה).

Without prejudice as to the inquiry into the ultimate derivation of the name (for it may not be Hebrew, but Babylonian or Kenite for example), most scholars hold that within the area of Hebrew as a living language the original pronunciation was *Yahweh* (יהוה). This is supported by the occurrence of the name in Samaritan rhyming verses, and by such transliterations as *ʾIaβe*, *Iaové*.

Now in the recently discovered Aramaic papyri relating to the Jewish colony in Egypt, the name is nearly always represented by the consonants (of

course unpointed) YHW (יהו). The editors invariably vocalize these as *Yahú* or *Jahú*.

But what connexion is there between *Yahweh* and *Yāhú*? The question seems worth the asking, because these papyri take us back to half a millennium before the Christian era. And can it really be considered likely or even possible that two such different-sounding names for God were used by the adherents of the same religion? Can the sound *ú* (i.e. presumably the sound of *oo* in *loop*) be regarded as a natural or reasonable abbreviation of, or a substitute for, the sound *weh* (almost like the sound of *we* in *went*)?

A distinguished Assyriologist tells me that there is nothing at all in Babylonian writing to suggest *Yahweh*, and that there is everything to suggest *Yāhú* and *Yah*, these two last words representing Babylonian transcriptions, or transliterations. I desire, however, to limit the inquiry to the field of Hebrew and Aramaic,—and Hebrew as a living language, not as written and pointed by the Massoretes long after it had become a sacred and literary instrument alone. The gap between Babylonian and Hebrew is so appreciable as to render any argument based on ultimate derivations or on the 'Babylonizing' of Hebrew words somewhat precarious. But Hebrew and Aramaic—such Aramaic especially as we find in the Bible and also in these Egyptian papyri—are closely related. And what seems hard to realize is that Jews in Egypt spoke of *Yāhú*, while Jews in other places spoke (on the current theory) of *Yahweh*.

Kautzsch (in *Enc. Bib.* col. 3321) regards *Yāhú* as an abbreviated form rising out of *Yahw* (יהו). *Yahw* is a true abbreviation of *Yahweh*, but it seems difficult to regard *Yāhú* in the same way. Is it not rather a substitution?

It will of course be said in reply to such objections that יהו must be vocalized יהוה, because in many O.T. proper names compounded with the sacred name the termination is so pointed by the Massoretes, e.g. Jeremiah, *Yirm'yāhú*. But the same objection applies here. If the name *Yahweh* was in actual use, and if it was desired to add it in some form to a personal name, why should the termination be so effectually disguised? Is it not possible that the Massoretic vocalization of proper names embodying the Divine name is as unscientific as their vocalization of the name itself? To point יהו was natural enough. If they took it as

a vowel-letter it must be pointed either *ú* or *ó*. In Jehoshaphat, e.g., it is *ó*. If the Divine name had now become unknown, and if there were no clear tradition about it, words embodying its consonants would naturally be pointed on the analogy of ordinary and familiar words. Arguments based on the M.T. reading *Yāhú* seem about as reasonable as the assertion that 'Jehovah' may after all be nearly right, since you get your first syllable letter-perfect in *Y^ehōshāphāt*!

I would respectfully ask the experts to tell us what there is definitely against the supposition that the letter ו (*waw*) is as truly consonantal in *YHW* as in *YHWH*. If this is so, then the abbreviation of YHWH to YHW is a real abbreviation. *Yahweh* will become *Yahw*. Subtract the sound *eh* from *Yahweh* and the remainder is a one-syllable word ending in two sounded consonants. Pronunciation of *w* as *v* would perhaps be clearer to us in the West.

Such an abbreviation as *Yahw* or *Yahv* would be an intermediate form between *Yahweh* and *Yah* which is of course frequently found, and found outside the Hebrew and Aramaic *locale*. And it would of course suggest the modification of the Massoretic text in such words as Jehoshaphat (which would on this theory become *Yahw-shāphāt*), and in the apocoped forms of some ל"ה verbs. For example, וישחתו would be pronounced *way-yish-tāhw*, which would be a true apocopation, instead of *way-yish-tā-hu*, which would have the same number of syllables as the non-apocoped form.

I realize that the whole question is complicated, and that the point of view possible from the Hebrew Grammar alone is one that needs supplementing, in regard, at all events, to the original form of the name YHWH. But I would venture, nevertheless, to ask whether we are justified in pointing YHW as *Yāhú* if the tetragrammaton was pronounced *Yahweh*? I shall hope to see something in these columns which may throw light upon the problem.

H. F. B. COMPSTON.

King's College, London.

Aramaic Papyri discovered at Assuan.

PRESSURE of work has prevented me from noticing sooner some difficult words in sections G, l. 10, and

M *ô*, l. 1, of this work. As far as I know, no satisfactory explanation of נִשְׁחַט and חֲנֻחָה in these lines has yet appeared. To me it seems certain to be the *Niph'al* of the Egyptian word *shṭ*, 'to weave.' See Brugsch, *Hieroglyph-demot. Wört.*, p. 1302, *Suppl.* 1115. On the equation of the hieroglyph, which Brugsch represents by *z*, with the Hebrew ט, see Erman's *Egyptian Grammar*, § 25, end, and the list of consonants in Brugsch, *op. cit. Suppl.*, p. 2.

The sense of חֲנֻחָה, again, can only be decided when we know exactly what נִסְכָּה, in the same line, means. The reader will find instructive notes on the subject in *P.S.B.A.*, vol. xxv. p. 202 f., and *Répertoire D'Épigraphie Sémitique*, i. p. 378 f. In the latter work Clermont-Ganneau maintains that the suggestions hitherto made cannot find support from Semitic etymology. The latest and, to my mind, the soundest view of the matter is that of Lidzbarski, who says that חֲנֻחָה must be a portable article and perhaps an Egyptian word (*Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik*, 1908, p. 238 f.). As נִסְכָּה may mean a *caster* or *melter* of metal, I suggest that חֲנֻחָה is equal to the Egyptian word *ḥnti*, 'statue,' 'Bildwerk' (Brugsch, *op. cit.*, p. 1112).

N. HERZ.

London.

Christ Healing in the Temple.

IN reply to Dr. Nestle's question in last month's EXPOSITORY TIMES under this heading, I must confess with sorrow that I did overlook Mt 21¹⁴. I most certainly consider that this passage contains instances of miracles of healing in the temple; and I have no excuse to offer for the oversight. I am grateful to Dr. Nestle for 'pulling me up.'

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

Hatch End.

The Forty Martyrs at Sebaste, in Armenia.

IN the last number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 168), in one of the illustrations for the Great Text, the stage of the martyrdom of the 'forty wrestlers for Christ' is placed in 'Northern Gaul.' Now, even for edifying purposes, preachers ought to be as historical as possible. In this case we

are in the fortunate position of having an original document of first rank: the very testament which the martyrs made before their death. The most convenient place where it is to be found is probably O. v. Gebhardt, *Acta martyrum selecta* (Berlin: Duncker, 1902), or R. Knopf, *Ausgewählte Märtyr-cracten* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1901; Collection of G. Krüger, ii. 2). Knopf gives only the testament; v. Gebhardt also the account of their passion. Their date is the 9th March; in the Roman Church, Innocent x. transferred it to the following day. J. Wordsworth (*The Ministry of Grace*, 1903) has the day in his Calendar; why it is neglected in *The Calendar of the Anglican Church*, Illustrated (Oxford and London, 1851), I do not know. Surely this testament is worthy of being generally known; we find in it the uncanonical saying of Christ, 'Where I find thee, I will judge thee.'

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Elisabeth.

THE explanations of Professor Ed. König on this name (on p. 185) do not exhaust, broad as they are—excuse this outburst of feeling—the possibilities:

1. Lagarde (*Register und Nachträge*, 1891, p. 69) saw in EAICABE® a transcriptional variation of EAICABEE, like *zenith* for *zemth*, *Monsoon* for *Mousim*; I may add NAYH for NAYN.

2. The explanation suggested by Professor König, confusion with *Sabbat*, is attested by Luther, who explained the name *quies Dei*, immo *requies Dei* (1516, *Works*, i. 60), who will have taken it from some mediæval source (*Onomastica sacra*, ed. Lagarde, 190, 37): 'Ελισάβετ κυρίου ἀνάπαυσις ἢ πλησμονή.

3. The change between *θ* and *τ* is the same as in Nazareth, Loth, etc.; we even find Elisabeth (see J. Denk in *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 4, 191 f.). *Tesabille* perhaps for the first time in an inscription of the fifth or sixth century in Montemor-o-novo (see *Inscriptiones Hispania Christianæ*, supplementum No. 324).

4. I suppose the last letter was added because the bearer of the name was a woman, to mark it as of the feminine gender.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

In the Study.

Professor Sanday's Article 'Bible.'

Professor Sanday has finished his article BIBLE for the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. This article, which will appear in the second volume of the *Encyclopædia*, will direct and enrich the study of the Bible as surely as the article by the same author in the second volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* influenced the study of Christ and the Gospels.

The Encyclopædia and the Preacher.

The Rev. James Donald, M.A., D.D., Parish Minister of Keithhall, Aberdeenshire, has already read the whole of the first volume of the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. He has not only read it, he has also compiled a complete index of its Scripture texts and other references. Like others he says he has been impressed with its extraordinary value to the preacher.

Dr. Donald drew up the list of texts and references for his own use. But he has sent a copy to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. We propose to publish the first portion of it next month.

Abaddon. [A Subject and a Sermon.]

1. The name of Abaddon has scarcely any place in English literature. It has almost dropped out of the English tongue. Its place has been taken by the name of Apollyon, which is mentioned as its Greek equivalent in the only passage where the word 'Abaddon' occurs in the Authorized Version, Rev 9¹¹.

This is due to the genius of John Bunyan. 'Bunyan's Apollyon,' says Swete, 'is in all but the name a creation of his own.' And it is such a creation that Apollyon, and not Abaddon, is familiar to us from our childhood as the name of the angel of the bottomless pit. It is due to Bunyan alone. For Milton does not use the name Apollyon, and he does once use Abaddon (*Par. Reg.* iv. 624).

The earliest occurrence of the name in English is in Wyclif's translation of the Bible (c. 1382). But it is much disguised. This is his translation of Rev 9¹¹: 'And thei hadden upon hem a kyng, the aungel of depnesse, to whom the name bi Ebru, Labadon, forsothe bi Greke, Appolion, and bi Latyn hauynge the name Destrier.' Purvey's revision of Wyclif's translation (c. 1388)

does not improve upon the spelling—'the name bi Ebrew is Laabadon.' Tindale dropped the initial L, but ignored the second 'd' (a mere dot in the Hebrew even when pointed). The earliest occurrence of the name in its proper spelling is in the Geneva N.T. of 1557. It had, however, already been used in Scotch. Murdoch Nisbet has Abaddon in his *New Testament in Scots*, which was written as early as 1520, though not published till issued by the Scottish Text Society in 1901.

To complete the history of the word in English: In the Preface to the R.V. of the Old Testament, the Revisers say: 'It may be mentioned that "Abaddon," which has hitherto been known to the English reader of the Bible only from the New Testament (Rev 9¹¹), has been introduced in three passages (Job 26⁶, Pr 15¹¹ 27²⁰), where a proper name appears to be required for giving vividness and point.' And then there is Tennyson's allusion in 'St. Simeon Stylites,' where Abaddon is linked with Asmodeus, the echo of an old but mistaken identification:

Devils pluck'd my sleeve,
Abaddon and Asmodeus caught at me.
I smote them with the cross.

2. Besides the history of the name in English, Abaddon has a place in the history of interpretation, and in the development of religious thought in Israel.

To begin with the development of religion. It is late in the history of Israel before Abaddon appears. The Hebrew word is confined to the Wisdom literature. The passages in which it is found are Job 26⁶ 28²² 31¹², Ps 88¹¹, Pr 15¹¹ 27²⁰. At first it is simply another name for the abode of the dead, usually called Sheol. We see this in the parallelism of Job 26⁶:

Hell (Sheol) is naked before him,
And destruction (Abaddon) hath no covering.

and perhaps more clearly in Ps 88¹¹:

Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave?
Or thy faithfulness in destruction (Abaddon, R.V. Destruction)?

But in process of time the meaning of the word (from Heb. 'abhadh, 'to perish') asserted itself, and Abaddon came to signify 'a lower deep,' 'a place of punishment,' 'the abode of the wicked.' For some

time, however, it was distinguished from Gehenna, as a place of punishment somewhat less severe, representing, as Shailer Mathews expresses it in the single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*, 'the negative element of extreme loss, rather than that of positive suffering.' But in post-Biblical Hebrew it is spoken of as the house of perdition (Targum on Job 26⁶), and is looked upon as the lowest and worst part of Gehenna.

But side by side with this development, which was a kind of degeneration, there went on another process of evolution. The name Abaddon, really an abstract term meaning 'destruction,' came to signify, as we have already seen, the place of destruction. Then the place was personified, just as Hades itself is personified in Rev 6⁸, until in the Apocalypse, as well as in Rabbinic literature, Abaddon becomes the personal designation of a fallen angel, the king of the locusts, the angel of the bottomless pit.

Thus in this unfamiliar word we see the Hebrew mind working along the lines of revelation, or what we should now call its own peculiar genius. It is interested in religion. It is also interested in morality. There comes a time when the necessity is felt of recognizing that sin has its wages and that the wages of sin is destruction. The departed are no longer to be thought of as living indiscriminately in Sheol. They who rejected the friendship of God here are deprived of it in the hereafter. And can there be sorer suffering than the sense of the want of fellowship with God? In the lowest deep there is a lower deep, and that lower deep is Abaddon.

3. But Abaddon has no less important a place in the history of interpretation. When Erasmus paraphrased the whole passage in the Apocalypse about the locusts and their king Abaddon, he had no hesitation in saying that the locusts are 'false teachers, heretykes and worldye suttell prelates,' who 'flie with their pardons and bulles, even as it wer with winges, over hilles and dales, over sea and land, and poison more noysomly unto death, than they should do with very bodyly weapons.' And the Roman Catholic translators of Rheims are ready with their retort. In the margin to the passage in the Apocalypse, Abaddon, they say, is 'the cheefe Maister of heretikes.' We have passed from that. We understand that in every place he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him, in every place and in every

communion. In his *Galatians*, in a note on 'Abba, Father,' Bishop Lightfoot recalls the other two examples of a double name, one Hebrew and one Greek, in the New Testament—'Satan, Diabolus' in Rev 12⁹ 20²; 'Abaddon, Apollyon' in 9¹¹—and he says these phrases are 'a speaking testimony to that fusion of Jew and Greek which prepared the way for the preaching of the gospel to the heathen. Accordingly St. Paul, in both passages in which he uses "Abba, Father," seems to dwell on it with peculiar emphasis, as a type of the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ.'

Abaddon and Apollyon, a type of the union in Christ! But we do not obliterate the distinction between the saint and the sinner, either in this life or in that which is to come. It may be true that we have been reversing the process of development of the ancient Israelite. While he turned Hades into a person, we have been turning Abaddon back into a locality or a state, and denying the very existence of angels. But we do not mingle good and evil indiscriminately. A Bible Dictionary of the year 1806 (its title is *Bibliotheca Sacra*) reminds us that 'Judas was called the son of perdition or destruction.' Judas is Abaddon, as every servant is that betrays his master, and every master that browbeats his servant. And more than that, we still hold that the relation of one man to another is a reflexion of the relation of a man to God. And we know no deep lower than the place which is deprived of the enjoyment of the love of God, no punishment more terrible than destruction from His presence.

LITERATURE.—The articles in *D.B.*, *Encycl. Bibl.*, *S.D.B.*, and especially the art. ABYSS in the *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*.

Rev 9¹¹, 'His name in Hebrew is Abaddon.'

What is the meaning of all the marvellous imagery in which the writer of the Apocalypse wraps up his message? No doubt it has come to him partly by tradition; it belongs to the stock-in-trade of Apocalyptic writers.¹ But it has not come to him entirely in that way. He lives in a stirring time, and his own imagination has been awakened to keenest intensity and utmost daring. When issues are sharp, when persecution is at the door to-day, and death or exile to-morrow, a man has to take sides. There is a difference between right

¹ W. Sanday, *J.Th.S.*, July 1907. See also *Exp. T.* xix. 49.

and wrong, between right and wrong men, between God and the devil. It has always been so in times of stress,—with Luther at the Reformation, with Milton at the Revolution, with Bunyan at the upheaval in his own personal life. It is then that a man understands the Apocalypse. It is then that he not only uses traditional language, but also beats out new imagery of his own. Startling, appalling imagery, as of locusts like horses prepared unto battle, with the faces of men and the hair of women, of a bottomless pit or abyss belching smoke till the sun and the air are darkened, and a king of the locusts, the angel of the abyss, whose name in the Hebrew is Abaddon.

His name in Greek is Apollyon, and that is the more familiar name. Apollyon is familiar in our mouths since childhood through the genius of John Bunyan. The name of Abaddon is scarcely to be found in English literature. But there is meaning in Abaddon too.

1. *The History of the Name.*—When it first appears in Scripture, Abaddon is simply a name for the place of the departed. It is a synonym for Sheol. But when once Israel had been led to grasp the idea that there is life still for those who have departed this life, it was but a step to the making of a distinction in the next world between the good and the bad. Abaddon became the place of punishment in the other world. The last step was its personification. The Hebrews have always had a genius for personifying. They have had no difficulty in so vividly realizing a state or place as to give it the functions of an individual. Isaiah can say of the king of Babylon, 'Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming' (Is 14⁹); and St. John completes the figure when he says, 'And I looked, and behold a pale horse; and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell followed with him' (Rev 6⁸). Abaddon, the bottomless pit, has become its angel, and king over the avenging locusts. The Israelites were led to this by a vivid imagination. And it is in line with the truth of things. For first, there *is* a distinction in *all* worlds between him that doeth good and him that doeth it not. And next it is no place or state that makes the distinction; it is in the man.

The mind is its own place, and in itself
Can make a Heaven of Hell, a Hell of Heaven.¹

¹ *Par. Lost*, i. 254 f.

2. *The Meaning of the Word.*—The word Abaddon means 'destruction'—not annihilation, however; the sense is rather 'perdition,' 'privation,' 'loss.' Thus the first conception of punishment in the other world is not the active infliction of castigation, it is the suffering that is due to the sense of loss. The wicked are deprived of the presence and the favour of God. And they know it. That makes Abaddon for them, deeper than Sheol, deeper at last (in the thoughts of the Rabbis) than even Gehenna—in the lowest deep a lower deep. It is so still. It is the great modern thought of punishment, the truth of which is eternal and unassailable; and if it is slower in its working than the fire and brimstone of a rougher time than ours, it is more persuasive in the end. To the writer of the Apocalypse, however, Abaddon is a person, active and aggressive. The name corresponds to the Greek Apollyon. There is an addition in the Vulgate. After 'Apollyon' the words are added—'Latine habens nomen Exterminans,' which Wyclif translates, 'bi Latyn hauynge the name Destrier.' The gloss is not unwarranted. For the loss of God's favour must either recover or harden. And if it hardens it becomes an active agent in opposition to God.

3. *What Abaddon is to us now.*—Two things. (1) First, Abaddon has a double name, one Hebrew and one Greek. He has been born too late. The gospel has come—the gospel that is to speak to Hebrew and to Greek indifferently; the gospel that is to bring Hebrew and Greek into harmony; the gospel under which there is to be no distinction, but all are to be one in Christ Jesus. (2) Secondly, it is significant that Abaddon, although he is the angel of the abyss, is sent out to make war upon the enemies of God; not upon God's own people, but only upon such men as have not the seal of God upon their foreheads (Rev 9⁴).² If a kingdom is divided against itself, said Jesus, that kingdom cannot stand. The kingdom of Satan is always divided against itself. Unity in evil-doing is a contradiction in terms. Outside fiction and folklore thieves are always suspicious of thieves, and robbers are always ready to betray robbers. The kingdom of Satan cannot stand, because it is the kingdom of Satan. And, more than that, it is God Himself that sends Abaddon to do this work. Professor

² G. H. Gilbert, *The First Interpreters of Jesus*, 359.

Driver¹ has been reminding us that as early as the Book of Deuteronomy, Jehovah is represented as allotting to the heathen the gods they worship (Dt 4¹⁹). For He is always King, and has never let even the devils out of hand.

A Sky Pilot. [*The Life of James Robertson.* By C. W. Gordon. Hodder & Stoughton. 6s.]

An abbot of Iona, the ninth, lay dying. He commanded them to bear his body eastward. Nor stay until the withes by which the coffin hung should break. The withes broke at the foot of a precipitous rock on the north bank of the Tay. There they laid the body to rest, and from the breaking of the withes, *dhullan*, they named the spot Dhull. At Dhull, now spelt Dull, the 'Sky Pilot' was born in 1839. His name was James Robertson.

He attended the village school. Gaelic was his mother tongue, but he became good at book English, good at Latin also, best at arithmetic. When he was about sixteen, a problem that had given some trouble in Edinburgh was sent down to the schoolmaster at Dull. The schoolmaster gave it to Robertson. When his father was going to bed that night, he said, 'Are you not coming to your bed, lad?' 'Yes, after a while,' replied the boy, scarcely looking up from his slate. Next morning the father came in to light the fire, and James rose from the spot where he had been left sitting the night before, with the solution of the problem in his hands.

In 1855 the family emigrated to Canada and settled on a clearing near Woodstock in Ontario. Work had to be done on the farm, school was six miles distant and attendance not quite regular, so the schoolmaster objected when James Robertson wished to sit the examination for a teacher's certificate. But what Robertson wished he accomplished always. He sat the examination, gained the certificate, and became a schoolmaster at the age of eighteen.

Then came his first communion. With a young friend he set off early for the two-mile walk to the church. 'We started as usual to walk two miles to church. As we went along the Governor's Road there was a bush, "Light's Woods," on the south side of the road. Robertson suggested that we turn aside into the bush, not saying for what

purpose. We penetrated it a short distance when, with a rising hill on our right and on comparatively level ground, the tall maples waving their lofty heads far above us, and the stillness of the calm sunny day impressing us with a sense of the awful, we came to a large stone. Robertson proposed that we engage in prayer. We knelt down together. He prayed that he might be true to the vows he was about to take, true to God and ever faithful in His service, and then he prayed for me also.'

The discipline at the Corner School was good, and Robertson obtained a larger school near Innerkip. At Innerkip he made the resolution to study for the ministry, and at Innerkip he fell in love for the first and last time. The young girl with whom he fell in love at first sight was the daughter of a farmer. The biographer of the 'Sky Pilot' thinks that her force in the evangelization of Canada was not less than her husband's. It was shown in waiting at home while he went afield—waiting and praying, training the family, and receiving him back to die. She tells the story of the courtship. 'It was in the fall of 1859 that my future husband, then a young man of about twenty-one years, came to our section to teach school, where he used his talents and influence for the good of all with whom he came in contact. He was an excellent teacher, loved and respected by parents and pupils alike. He soon found his way to my father's and mother's home, for the former teachers had not been strangers there. He said afterwards that when he saw me for the first time that day in my own home, he determined that I should be his. The task proved to be not as easy as may have seemed; but he had made up his mind, and, in after years in more important matters, when he won in spite of difficulties, so it was then. He poured forth his wealth of love and affection and compelled me to love him in return as I had never loved before. Of course he had to wait, but the time did not seem long. It was unalloyed bliss. Three years of school, of walks and talks, and when he left for college there were the letters, the visits, the hopes and aspirations and preparations, and with all at times a tinge of sadness, lest I was not quite worthy of it all.'

Robertson studied at Knox College, Toronto, at Princeton Theological Seminary, and at Union Seminary, New York. On September 23, 1869, they were married. He had worked, and she

¹ S. R. Driver and W. Sanday, *Christianity and other Religions*, 1908, 35.

had waited for twelve years. A few weeks after the marriage he was ordained and inducted into the pastoral charge of Norwich, a small village in the south-east of Oxford County in the Province of Ontario. At Norwich, as everywhere else, he was remembered as a man who never did things by half. One Sabbath evening, after the service had begun, the fire bells rang. Mr. Robertson dismissed the congregation. A neighbouring hotel was on fire. The minister immediately took command of the situation, organized the crowd, and suppressed the fire. In gratitude for his services, and in sympathy with his exhausted condition, the hotel-keeper brought him a bottle of brandy with which to refresh himself. 'Never will I forget,' writes a member of his congregation, 'the manner in which he seized that brandy bottle by the neck, swung it round his head, and dashed it against the brick wall, exclaiming as he did so, "That's a fire that can never be put out."'

But he had heard the call of the West. Far up in the interior were mining and ranching communities almost entirely neglected by the Presbyterian as by the other Churches. It is not strange, therefore, that men mingling with native races descended to the level and often below the level of those pagan people, and, forgotten by their Church, themselves forgot their fathers' religion and their fathers' God. Certain it is that, many years after, their sons were discovered, grown to young manhood, who had never heard except in oaths the name of Jesus, and knew nothing of the story of man's redemption. 'It was no easy task to secure missionaries for Western Canada. The country was remote, the field was hard, distances were great, privations many, isolation trying. Occasionally a man broke down and retired to the East. Nisbet dropped at his post, and ever as the Presbytery met rumours were exchanged of settlements still beyond, unreachd by the message of the gospel.'

On the evening of Tuesday, December 30, 1873, a young minister from the country, tall and spare of form and rugged of face, stood in the Union Station at Toronto, facing the westward trail. It was the Rev. James Robertson of Norwich. In ten days he was in Winnipeg. The journey can be done now in two nights and a day, in a Pullman car, with dinner on board. 'Accommodation was tolerable to Moorhead,' writes

Robertson, 'but in the three staging days things were intolerable. I never tasted butter; beef and potatoes only kept me alive. Bread was an outrage on the name. Potatoes were good if left whole, but when you mashed them you did not know what you had. The beef would do for patent-leather soles; you could eat it, but rubbing it on a dirty plate and cleaning a dirty knife and trying to cut it, you ate your peck of dirt certainly.' His face is to the West, but his heart is at home. 'How are you all? I went to the post-office to-day to see if there might not be something, but was disappointed, as I might expect, for you have had no time yet. How I would like to look in on you all and see how you are doing. Tina and Willie will be just about going to bed, and what about "Ba Buddy"? I feel lonesome already without you all. How shall it be before July? You must write me often and regularly, else I am afraid I cannot stand it.'

He was called to Knox Church, Winnipeg. Streams of emigrants passed through on their way to the farther West. Sometimes he went with them part of the way; sometimes his heart went farther than his feet. Years after, away in the far West, a man drove up one day to a comfortable homestead, and in the house he 'found an old Scotch lady and her two sons, fine young fellows. I mentioned the name of Dr. Robertson, and at once the shrewd old face took on a different look. It seemed to fill up with kindness, and she began to talk. She had a remarkable story to tell. Twenty-one years before, she, with her husband and two baby boys, had come to Winnipeg. They had not much money, and all they had they invested in an ox team wagon and general outfit. They spent a Sunday at the immigration sheds in Winnipeg. The Presbyterian minister came down to preach to the emigrants in the afternoon. The place was uncomfortable and crowded. Her baby was fretful, and so the mother sat outside the door—it was a warm spring day—and there she listened to the sermon. She could not see the preacher's face, but she gave me a good bit of that sermon. The theme was Abraham and his north-west adventure, and the parallel was drawn between him and these people who were about to seek their fortune in the West. The two main thoughts that the old lady carried with her for these twenty years were these: "God is going with you. Do

not be discouraged. Never give up hope," and "You are going to make a new country—build your foundations for God." She remembered the grip of the minister's hand as next day he went with them far out on to the prairie to set them on their westward journey, and how, standing there, he bade them a cheery farewell and watched them almost out of sight.'

After seven years' work in Winnipeg, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, having received a petition from the Presbytery of Manitoba praying for the appointment of a Superintendent of Missions, 'unanimously determined that James Robertson, presently pastor of Knox Church, Winnipeg, be appointed Superintendent of Missions, in the North-West, his salary to be two thousand dollars, this to cover all expenses, while he may be labouring in Manitoba or the immediate neighbourhood; journeys to distant points, such as Edmonton, to be paid by the Assembly's Home Mission Committee.' He received the appointment by wire. He wired acceptance.

His business was to gather congregations and then find ministers for them. Late on Saturday evening he comes to a settlement where the largest building is the hotel, and the largest room the bar. He inquires of the hotel man—

'Is there any place where I can hold a service to-morrow?'

'Service?'

'Yes, a preaching service.'

'Preaching? Oh yes, I'll get you one,' he replies, with genial heartiness.

Next day Mr. Robertson comes into the bar, which is crowded with men.

'Well, have you found a room for my service?' he inquires of his genial host.

'Here you are, boss, right here. Get in behind that bar, and here's your crowd. Give it to 'em. God knows they need it.'

Mr. Robertson catches the wink intended for the 'boys' only. Behind the bar are bottles and kegs and other implements of the trade; before it men standing up for their drinks, chaffing, laughing, swearing. The atmosphere can hardly be called congenial, but the missionary is 'on to his job' as the boys afterwards admiringly say. He gives out a hymn. Some of the men take off their hats and join in the singing, one or two of them whistling an accompaniment. As he is

getting into his sermon one of the men, evidently the smart one of the company, breaks in.

'Say, boss,' he drawls, 'I like yer nerve, but I don't believe yer talk.'

'All right,' replies Mr. Robertson, 'give me a chance. When I get through you can ask any questions you like. If I can I will answer them, if I can't I'll do my best.'

The reply appeals to the sense of fair play in the crowd. They speedily shut up their companion and tell the missionary to 'fire ahead,' which he does, and to such good purpose that when he has finished there is no one ready to gibe or question. After the service is closed, however, one of them observes earnestly—

'I believe every word you said, sir. I haven't heard anything like that since I was a kid, from my Sunday school teacher. I guess I gave her a pretty hard time. But look here, can't you send a missionary for ourselves? We'll all chip in, won't we, boys?'

A missionary is sent in, and it is not long before a strong congregation is established in that community.

It was more difficult to find men than congregations. It was most difficult of all to find money. The story is here. In his early student days Robertson went out one morning to a preaching engagement. 'We came to a part of the road that was through bush. The horse could not trot for water, stumps on one side, quagmire on the other. Judging that the chances lay in favour of the superior resistance of the stumps, we tried the quagmire, and succeeded in all cases in getting to the other side.' This became a habit. All his life he succeeded in getting to the other side. In 1887 the Presbyterian College of Montreal conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Ten years later he had to come home. 'It will be quite a treat,' wrote his wife, 'to have him with us during the Christmas season. Never *once* since 1881 has he been at home for the holiday season.' He died in 1902.

Pampsychism.

In the second edition of Professor Carveth Read's *The Metaphysics of Nature* (A. & C. Black; 7s. 6d. net) the most noticeable change is a series of appendixes. In one of them there is some exposition and discussion of that amazing new doctrine of a universal consciousness. The stone

and the tree—they are conscious also. The next step? That they have a conscience, perhaps.

'I read so slowly,' says Professor Carveth Read, 'and therefore so much less than most other students, that I was not aware when the first edition of this work appeared that several contemporaries agree with me in this doctrine of the universality of consciousness in Nature. Having learnt better, it is with the greatest satisfaction that I refer the reader for a fuller exposition of it to C. A. Strong's brilliant volume, *Why the Mind has a Body*, and to F. Paulsen's *Einleitung in die Philosophie* (see especially ch. i. § 6). Indeed, so rapidly has the doctrine spread that it has obtained a name: it is Pampsychism; and I, to my astonishment, am a Pampsychist. Misfortunes that could not be foreseen and cannot be evaded must be borne with resignation.'

Nor the Power of God.

The Rev. W. Garrett Horder has published a small volume of sermons on *The Other-World* (Macmillan; 3s. net). The sermons were preached not to prove that there is another world, but to say as much as can be said about the nature of it. Not much can be said. Many things that are frequently said in the pulpit, and quite comfortably believed in the pew, have no foundation either in Scripture or in common sense. Mr. Garrett Horder is willing to own that his ignorance is more portentous than his knowledge. Still he has some things to say and to stand by. And his book will be the more appreciated that it is written under restraint.

He takes it for granted, as we have said, that there is another world. How can a lover of the Lord Jesus Christ have any doubt about it? But some men doubt it. Some men are courageous enough even to deny it. With all that Mr. Garrett Horder says about the other world, the most striking thing in his book is a letter from Mr. John M. Robertson, M.P., in which that clever apologist for unbelief gives his reasons for not believing in any world to come.

And what do you think his reasons are? He has just one reason, and he got it when he was a boy. When he was a boy he read something in Dickens about a woman who had lost her husband early and who had now grown old. Had the husband grown old also? If not, how should they receive one another when they met? He himself

had lost a little brother. The difficulty was insurmountable. So he gave up all belief in another world; like the Sadducees, 'not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God.'

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. J. K. Douglas Bedwell, Cambridge, to whom a copy has been sent of Macgregor's *Jesus Christ the Son of God*.

Illustrations for the Great Text for March must be received by the 1st of February. The text is Dt 34^{5, 6}.

The Great Text for April is Rev 1^{5, 6}—'Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood; and he made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father; to him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.' A copy of Professor J. Arthur Thomson's *The Bible of Nature* or Rutherford's *St. Paul's Epistles to Colossæ and Laodicea* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for May is Rev 1¹⁰—'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' A copy of Clark Murray's *Handbook of Christian Ethics* or of Professor J. Arthur Thomson's *The Bible of Nature* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for June is Rev 1^{17, 18}—'And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as one dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying, Fear not; I am the first and the last, and the Living one; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and of Hades.' A copy of Fairweather's *The Background of the Gospels* or any recent volume of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for July is Rev 2⁷—'To him that overcometh, to him will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God.' A copy of Adeney's *Greek and Eastern Churches* or of Rutherford's *Epistles to Colossæ and Laodicea* will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.